LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 135 — 82nd Congress

Chapter 374—1st Session

H. R. 3973

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DIGEST OF HISTORY ON H. R. 3973

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952. To provide funds for the operation of Department of Agriculture for 1952 and for other purposes.

Agreed 222 to 138 to a motion by Rep. Aspinall, Colorado, to provide $2,700,000 for forest pest control to combat the Englemann spruce bark beetle in the national forests in Colorado, (House figure $1,7000,000 Senate figure $3,600,000) (amendment 21).

Added the following language to the item inserted by the Senate (amendment 30) providing $700,000 for cooperative range improvements, Forest Service: "Provided, that no part of this appropriation shall be available in any national forest in excess of three times the amount available for such forest from sources (including claims recognized by the Act of December 29, 1950, and receipts under 16 U.S.C. 500) other than Federal sources".

Agreed to the Senate language (amendment 42) under the item, "Marketing Services," to provide "That hereafter there may be transferred to appropriations available for classing or grading any agricultural commodity without charge to the producers thereof such sums from non-administrative funds to the Commodity Credit Corporation as may be necessary in addition to other funds available for these purposes, such transfers to be reimbursed from subsequent appropriations therefor."

Agreed to the Senate amendment (No. 60) increasing the administrative-expense limitation for Commodity Credit Corporation from $15,000,000 to $16,500,000 but modified the provision requiring a portion of the appropriation to be placed in reserve until needed because of substantial surpluses on basic commodities requiring mandatory price support, by increasing the amount of the reserve from $1,000,000 to $2,500,000.

Agreed to the Senate amendment (No 67) limiting the number of persons engaged in personnel work to that number provided by a ratio of one personnel employee to every 115 employees.

RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946 (Title II): Partial restoration of House cut - $50,000

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS: Economic investigations: Partial restoration of House cut - $150,000. Crop and livestock estimates: Decrease to provide, together with House cut, a reduction of $17,596 (10%) in Budget estimate for personal services.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION: Office of Administrator: Decrease to provide, together with House cut, a reduction of $45,560 (10%) in Budget estimate for personal services. Language authorizing a heating plant and alterations in one building at Greenfield, Massachusetts, at a cost not to exceed $7,500.

RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA: Partial restoration of House cut. - $11,550.

OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS: Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico: Partial restoration of House cut for payments to Alaska. Total for payments to States $15,000. Salaries and expenses: Decrease to provide, together with House cut, a reduction of $32,910 (10%) in Budget estimate for personal services.

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY: Animal research: Partial restoration of House cut. $120,000. Conference report states that the $49,300 authorized above the amount proposed by the House is to be used for research on infectious and noninfectious diseases. Animal disease control and eradication: Decrease to provide, together with House cut, a reduction of $186,978 (10%) in Budget estimate for personal services. Eradication of sheep scabies.

Marketing agreements, hog cholera virus and serum: Decrease to provide for 10% reduction in Budget estimate for personal services. Meat inspection: House inserted language authorizing reimbursement by firms and establishments desiring additional meat inspection services.

BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY: Partial restoration of House cut. $41,080. Conference report indicates that the work at Mandan, N. D. and Woodward Oklahoma should be continued within the funds provided.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY. Partial restoration of House cut. $100,000.

BUREAU OFPLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING: Plant, soil, and agricultural engineering research: Decrease to provide, together with House cut, a reduction of $370,670 (10%) in Budget estimate for personal services. Hybrid onion research at Parma, Idaho, station.
Research on wheat mosaic. Senate inserted funds and language authorizing the construction of a laboratory at Orlando, Florida, for citrus and subtropical fruit research; Conference report provides that the $275,000 authorized represents the full Federal contribution for the cost of the laboratory but not necessarily the full cost.

National Arboretum: Decrease to provide for 10% reduction in Budget estimate for personal services.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE: Insect investigations: Partial restoration of House cut, of which $75,000 is earmarked as follows: For miscellaneous insects attacking cereal and grass crops (including green bugs and chinch bugs) $50,000. For carriers of Oak wilt and control methods, $15,000. Control methods for eradication of screw worm through use of radiant energy, $20,000. Conferees agreed to earmarking by the Senate indicated above and, in addition, earmarked $50,000 for research on the wheat stem fly and Japanese beetle. Insect and plant disease control: Partial restoration of House cut. $216,062.

FOREST PESTS, CONTROL OF: Partial restoration of House cut for Colorado spruce bark beetle control project. $1,900,000.

FOREST SERVICE: National forest protection and management: Partial restoration of House cut to provide for the administration of an expanding timber sale business on the national forests.

Forest research: Decrease to provide, together with House cut, a reduction of $278,897 (10%) in Budget estimate for personal services.

Restoration of House cut for establishment of a new forest and range research center in New Mexico, and expansion of forest research work in Puerto Rico.

Forest development roads and trails: Partial restoration of House cut for construction of roads to inaccessible areas of national forest timber.

Acquisition of lands for national forests: Weeks Act: Restoration of House Cut $50,000.

Superior National Forest: Restoration of House cut $60,000.

Special Acts: Decrease to provide for 10% reduction in Budget estimate for personal services.

Cooperative Range improvements: House deleted funds and language for the construction and maintenance of range improvements: Senate partially restored House cut and revised language: Conferees report amendment in disagreement.

FLOOD CONTROL: Conference report states that it is expected that special attention will be given to projects where work is in process but has heretofore been delayed.

Language providing that not to exceed $60,000 may be used for surveys of the watersheds of the Big Nemaha River, Little Nemaha River, and Weeping Water Creek in Nebraska

Conference report states that although this language is stricken, the Conferees expect the Department to give this matter special attention in connection with special studies being made in the Missouri Basin area.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE:
Salaries and expenses: House retained language proposed for deletion in Budget, requiring that expenditures for research work in the Florda Everglades be matched by State or local funds.

Decrease to provide for 10% reduction in Budget estimate for personal services. $803,000.

Water conservation and utilization projects: Partial restoration of House cut. $100,000.

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION: Conservation and use of agricultural land resources: Partial restoration of House cut for assistance to farmers in carrying out approved soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices. $23,500,000.

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION - Cont'd. Conservation and use of agricultural land resources. Partial restoration of House cut in the advance authorization for 1952 crop year, $55,000,000.

COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY: Decrease to provide for 10% reduction in Budget estimate for personal services.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION: Decrease to provide, together with House cut, a reduction of $250,089 (10%) in Budget estimate for personal services.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION: Borrowing authorizations: Senate reduced by $25,000,000 the $100,000,000 contingent loan authorization, inserted by contingent loan authorization, inserted by House for the rural electrification program, and added a contingent loan authorization of $25,000,000 for the rural telephone program.

FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION: Borrowing authorizations: Production and subsistence loans: Restoration of House cut $10,000,000. Water facilities loans: Restoration of House cut $750,000. Salaries and expenses: Partial restoration of House cut $650,000.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION: Salaries and expenses: Partial restoration of House cut in direct appropriation for research and service work in connection with farmer's cooperatives - $100,000. Total for salaries and expenses - $100,000.

EXTENSION SERVICE: Senate decrease, together with House cut provided a reduction of $199,082 (10%) in Budget estimate for personal services.

OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS: Decrease to provide for 10% reduction in Budget estimate for personal services.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION: Decrease to provide for 10% reduction in Budget estimate for personal services.

LIBRARY: Decrease to provide for 10% reduction in Budget estimate for personal services.

RESEARCH ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL AGRICULTURAL MATERIALS: Senate provided Budget amendment for intensified research to develop replacements for specific applications of stockpiled castor oil and for research on castor bean production.

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT: Budget provided for reimbursement to CCC for costs incurred during the fiscal year 1950 in carrying out its functions under the International Wheat Agreement by transfer from "Removal of surplus agricultural commodities"; House deleted entire item: Senate and Conferees provide a direct appropriation to reimburse CCC - $76,808,000.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION: Partial restoration of House cut in appropriations of administrative expense.

GENERAL PROVISIONS: Section 409. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be used toppay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: Provided, that this inhibition shall not apply — (a) to not to exceed 25 percentum of all vacancies; (b) to positions filled from within the department; (c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; (d) to seasonal and casual workers; (e) to meat inspectors; (f) to field employees of the Soil Conservation Service and Production and Marketing Administration who provide conservation assistance to farmers and ranchers; (g) to field operating and research employees engaged in work of county offices and other field locations; (h) to employees of the crop and livestock reporting service; "Provided further, That with the exception of the agencies and functions listed in (a)to (h) above, not more than 90 percentum of the amounts shown in the budget estimates for personal services shall be available for such purpose: Provided further, That when the total number of personnel subject to this section has been reduced to 90 percentum of the total provided for in the budget estimates for 1952, this section may cease to apply: Provided further, That in addition to the funds otherwise allowed under this section, the following agencies shall be allowed additional sums for personnel as follows: Commodity Exchange Authority, $58,928; Extension Service, salaries and expenses, $31,327; Office of the Secretary, $32,832; Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, $26,946.

Section 410: Language providing a limitation on the number of personnel workers in relation to the number of persons served.

Section 411: Revised language prohibiting (except for the car officially assigned to the Secretary of Agriculture) the employment of any civilian employee whose principal duties consists of acting as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle, other than a bus or ambulance.

Section 412: Senate inserted language reducing funds available for information work to 75% of the amount contemplated in the 1952 Budget; Conferees agreed to Senate language and added at the end the following proviso:
"Provided, That this section shall not apply to personnel engaged in the preparation and distribution of technical agricultural publications and farmers bulletins, and the Agriculture Year book, the reporting and dissemination of the results of research and investigations, the preparation and broadcasting of the 'Farm and Home Hour' and similar radio programs, and other work required to carry out the duties and responsibilities of the Department imposed by law other than work intended primarily for press, radio and television services, and popular publications."

INDEX TO DEBATE ON H. R. 3973

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 3973

February 9, 1951	Hearings: House, H.R. 3973, Part 1.
February 21, 1951	Hearings: House, Part 2.
May 4, 1951	House Committee on Appropriations reported H. R. 3973. House Report 421. Print of Bill as reported.
May 9, 1951	House began and concluded general debate.
May 10, 1951	House continued debate
May 15, 1951	House debate continued. Voted on amendment to reduce flood control (pp 5472-80). Appropriations for Soil Conservation Service. (pp 5481-2). Advance authorization under Agricultural Conservation Program. (pp5480 - 98).
May 17, 1951	House concluded debate and passed H. R. 3973 with amendments. Agreed; 214-153 to the Jensen amendments, providing for reduction in personnel; Hiselton amendment providing that $1,000,000 of CCC administrative funds be placed in reserve; Harris amendment to provide not over $1,000,000 be used under "Agricultural production programs" for measurement of acreage planted to cotton; Anderson amendment to reduce Office of the Secretary by $75,000 by vote of 78-53; Smith amendment prohibiting funds for "publicity or propaganda" in regard to support or defeat of legislation.
May 21, 1951	Print of H. R. 3973 as referred to Senate Committee on appropriations.
May 31, 1951	Amendment by Senator Johnston. Print of amendment as referred.
July 20, 1951	Authority to file Report on H.R. 3973.
	Senate Committee reported H.R.3973. Senate Report 561.
July 21, 1951	Reported, under order of the Senate. Print of H. R. 3973 with amendments.
July 23, 1951	Amendment by Senator Williams. Amendment as printed.
	Hearings: Senate, on H.R. 3973.

July 24, 1951	Senate began debate on H.R. 3973
July 25, 1951	Senate debate continued
July 26, 1951	Senate debate continued.
July 27, 1951	Passed H.R.3973 in the Senate by a vote of 65-6 Senate conferees appointed.
	Print of the bill with the amendments of the Senate numbered.
August 13, 1951	House conferees appointed
August 16, 1951	House received conference report. House Report 886.
August 17, 1951	House agreed to conference report.
August 20, 1951	Senate agreed to the conference report.
August 31, 1951	Approved. Public Law 135.

82D CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
1st Session } { No. 421

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

MAY 4, 1951.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. WHITTEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 3973]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1952. The bill covers all estimates contained in the 1952 Budget, pages 344 through 480, and House Document No. 66, Eighty-second Congress.

The bill includes direct annual appropriations of $720,157,433, loan funds for the Rural Electrification Administration and Farmers' Home Administration of $251,250,000, and administrative expense authorizations for the corporations of the Department of $18,954,000. The amount recommended for direct appropriation is $52,742,267 less than funds available for 1951 and $99,848,113 less than the estimates for 1952. The loan funds authorized are $193,250,000 less than amounts available for 1951 and $10,750,000 below the 1952 estimates, and administrative expenses limitations are $1,530,000 below the authorizations for 1951 and $5,200,000 under the estimates for 1952.

The following summary sets forth the committee action with respect to the amounts in the bill:

Summary of the bill

Item	Appropriations, 1951 (as reduced under sec. 1214)	Estimates, 1952	Recommended in bill for 1952	Bill compared with—	
				1951, as reduced under sec. 1214	1952 estimates
Direct annual appropriations:					
Title I—Regular activities	$772, 500, 700	$786, 605, 546	$719, 707, 433	−$52, 793, 267	−$66, 898, 113
Title II—Special activities	399, 000	33, 400, 000	450, 000	51, 000	−32, 950, 000
Total, direct annual appropriations	772, 899, 700	820, 005, 546	720, 157, 433	−52, 742, 267	−99, 848, 113
Loan authorizations	444, 500, 000	262, 000, 000	251, 250, 000	−193, 250, 000	−10, 750, 000
Administrative expense limitations	20, 484, 000	24, 154, 000	18, 954, 000	−1, 530, 000	−5, 200, 000

COMPARISON WITH WORLD WAR II

In view of the fact that we are again in a period of defense preparedness, it seems appropriate to compare the appropriations and personnel provided for herein with those for the period just prior to World War II. The appropriations for the Department for each of the three years preceding the last war were in excess of $1,000,000,000. The amount provided in 1941 was $1,543,000,000, more than twice the amount of $720,157,433 recommended in the 1952 bill. During this same period the Department has reduced its personnel by nearly 40,000, from 108,000 in 1941 to less than 70,000 in 1951.

This comparison has particular significance when it is realized that the 1952 funds cover many new activities such as the School Lunch Program, the Rural Telephone Program, the Farm Housing Program, and the Research and Marketing Act, which were not in existence in 1941. It is also impressive in view of the increase of from 100 to 200 percent in the cost of most of the items required by the Department, the fact that legislation has increased salaries nearly 50 percent, and the fact that much of the work for which funds were made available during the last war by transfer from defense appropriations is being performed by the Department during the current emergency within its regular funds.

In a number of instances the amounts in the bill for 1952 are below what some of the members of the committee would have preferred. However, it is generally agreed that, in view of the urgent need to curtail Federal expenses, agricultural programs should share in the reductions required. In making personnel reductions required by amounts approved for 1952, the Department should make certain that the average salary of each Bureau is not changed substantially from that now in effect.

POSITION OF AGRICULTURE IN DEFENSE EFFORT

The productive ability of American agriculture has assumed added importance during recent months, since preparedness means adequate supplies of food and fiber as well as tanks, planes, and guns. Demands are being made upon the farmer to expand his production to meet the ever increasing needs of our combined civilian and military efforts.

This expanded production involves increases in 1951 over 1950 of 10,000,000 acres of cotton (54 percent increase), 5,600,000 acres of corn, 3,000,000 acres of wheat, and 300,000 acres of rice. Every evidence indicates that the farmer is responding wholeheartedly to this situation and is doing everything possible to assure abundant food supplies for the future. This committee is proud to be dealing with a segment of our economy which is making this significant contribution to the defense effort.

The committee is concerned somewhat, however, lest this patriotic effort result in serious damage to the position of the average farmer throughout the country. The farmer is not only depleting the fertility of his soil as a result of such intensive cultivation, but is also endangering the selling price of his commodities through the large expansion in production which in a short time might result in surpluses.

Whereas defense production funds are being loaned to industry to establish plants and provision is being made for them to amortize completely the cost of these facilities in a short period of time, no provision is being made to compensate the farmer for depreciation on his farm and for loss in fertility of his soil. Whereas expansion in industry is being underwritten to a large extent by firm defense contracts of the Federal government, the only guarantee being offered the farmer is a percentage of parity—which is not a guarantee of profit. In fact, parity does not even take cost of production into consideration. It was set up by the Congress as a means of establishing a floor under commodity prices and 90 percent of parity is somewhat like the minimum wage guarantee of 75 cents per hour, which is far below the average wage. Accordingly, the committee believes that the soil conservation program of the Department in which the farmer contributes about two-thirds of the cost must be continued in 1952 at a comparatively high level to assure continued emphasis on maintaining the fertility of the land. The committee also feels that sufficient administrative funds should be provided for the Commodity Credit Corporation for 1952 to assure that the price support program can be operated to whatever extent may become necessary in the event our defense effort results in large surpluses of our basic commodities.

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT PROGRAMS

The committee is also convinced of the need to continue strong agricultural credit sources in this period of rising costs. A recent study conducted by Cornell University indicates that, while receipts on the average farm have increased nearly nine times during the past 40 years, expenses per farm have increased 14 times during the same period. This study also indicates that the total capital investment per farm has increased almost four times during this period and that the ratio of farm real estate to the total capital investment has decreased from 73 percent to approximately 45 percent. Another significant factor revealed by the report is that 40 years ago it would have taken 10 years for the average farmer to lose his entire equity in his farm, whereas at the present time he can lose his entire equity in 2½ years. In view of the general agricultural situation pointed up by this study, the committee feels it advisable to continue the credit programs of the Department in 1952 at substantially the same level as for 1951.

REPAYMENT RECORD OF LENDING PROGRAMS

Testimony received indicates that delinquent payments on rural electrification loans are less than three-tenths of one percent and that approximately 95 percent of all matured Farmers' Home Administration loans have been collected. Information furnished the committee indicates that repayments on REA loans are $24,582,000 ahead of schedule, that collections on farm ownership and housing loans are 33 percent more than required on a scheduled amortization basis, and that collections on production and subsistence loans during the past four years have exceeded loans made by $57,000,000. In addition, final settlement is being made on the old Rural Rehabilitation and Emergency Crop and Feed loans, with nearly 100 percent repayment. The Committee is impressed by this excellent record.

RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

The committee has given careful consideration to the relative importance of agricultural research during the current emergency, in view of the immeasurable contribution which it has made to the sound position of agriculture and the need for continued research to assure the abundant production needed for the defense effort. Despite the strongest belief in research and knowing of the returns from such work, the committee feels that research funds throughout the Department should, under existing circumstances, be reduced by approximately ten percent. This action was taken in view of the shortage of manpower and materials which can be expected during the next year or more, particularly the shortage in experienced and trained research personnel, in view of the fact that many research projects carried on in the past are no longer valuable in view of changing emergency conditions, and in view of the fact that those lines of research which are designed to provide information for use during normal peacetime periods cannot be profitably carried on until the country returns to more normal conditions. It is believed that the amounts retained in the bill will permit the continuation of those projects which will make the most important contribution in the present emergency.

On the other hand the committee feels that the amounts recommended are thoroughly justified and absolutely essential in view of the importance of such work to the continued stability of agriculture, on which the entire Nation depends, and in view of the need to provide a relatively constant level of funds from year to year to make certain that the value which comes from continuous study over a long period of years is not lost.

RMA ADVISORY COMMITTEES

The continued successful experience with the advisory committees appointed under the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 is a source of gratification to the committee. Last year the committee consolidated research funds in the Department, and during the past year these groups have been brought into contact with more of the regular research work of the Department, in line with the committee's suggestion that these advisory groups participate in the formulation

and review of all research plans of the Department. Statements made to the committee indicate that increased use of these advisory committees has been extremely helpful to officials of the Department in arriving at the research program of the Department and that results per dollar spent are being increased.

ORGANIZATION OF FIELD ACTIVITIES

Last year the committee called attention to its concern about the matter of inefficient administration and operation within the Department, particularly in the field, primarily as a result of the investigation made of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine. Investigations made since that time indicate that similar conditions exist to some extent in other bureaus of the Department. They also bring out many examples of excessive layers of supervision, duplication of effort and overstaffing in the field activities, and point out the complete lack of uniformity in field organization and jurisdictional boundaries among the various programs. For example, each of several branches of PMA have three or four different and unrelated regional arrangements for the major programs under their jurisdiction. Generally, each bureau and agency of the Department has its own field pattern at the county, State, area and regional level, each operating entirely independently of the other, and each with its own office space, clerical help, administrative services, and lines of responsibility to Washington. According to information received, there are a number of cities where a single branch within a bureau has two or more separate offices, and within a single city there may be separate field offices of several dozen branches or bureaus, each operating independently and sometimes without knowledge of the existence of the others.

While the order of the Secretary of Agriculture issued on February 15, will help to correct some of these conditions through fuller coordination of programs and further consolidation of field offices, the committee is of the opinion that this represents only a beginning. The committee feels that further attention must be given to the following problems:

1. Developing greater uniformity of area boundaries and lines of responsibility.
2. Developing a stronger Departmental program through consolidation of field offices and coordination of their activities.
3. Promoting increased economy and efficiency through elimination of excessive layers of supervision and centralization of administrative and housekeeping activities into area or regional offices.

The committee expects to look into these matters further during the next year and plans to devote considerable time to them during the hearings for 1953.

RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT

Appropriations, 1951 (as reduced under Sec. 1214)	$5, 932, 000
Budget estimates, 1952	5, 500, 000
Recommended for 1952	4, 700, 000
Reduction:	
1951 as reduced	1, 232, 000
1952 estimates	800, 000

This appropriation provides for expansion of marketing research, service, and education activities in which the Department of Agriculture, the State Agricultural Experiment Stations, the Cooperative State Agricultural Extension Services, the State Departments of Agriculture, and other public and private agencies cooperate. The funds are alloted directly to agencies of the Department for specified projects, or to State agencies on a matching fund basis.

The committee approves $4,700,000 for 1952, which is $1,232,000 less than funds available for 1951 and $800,000 less than the estimates for 1952. This represents a general reduction of 10% in all projects included in this appropriation together with a reduction of approximately 50% in funds requested for the project "Expansion of outlets for farm products". In view of the recent trend away from a buyers market, it is doubtful that the same attention needs to be given to the expansion of foreign outlets and to the study of consumer preference and demand.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

Appropriations, 1951 (as reduced under sec. 1214)	$5, 478, 000
Budget estimates, 1952	5, 395, 000
Recommended for 1952	5, 000, 000
Reduction:	
1951 as reduced	478, 400
1952 estimates	395, 000

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics is the chief economic research and statistical agency of the Department. Its functions include research on the economics of agriculture, involving such factors as costs, prices, income, production and distribution, farm methods and practices, land ownership and values, farm population and farm finance, and the issuance periodically for public information of crop and livestock estimates.

A total of $5,000,000 is recommended for 1952, $2,150,000 for economic investigations and $2,850,000 for crop and livestock estimates. The amount approved for crop and livestock estimates is substantially the same as for 1951, because of the continuing importance of accurate information on which many programs and policies of the Nation, both foreign and domestic, are dependent. On the other hand, the committee has reduced funds for economic investigations substantially in view of the absolute necessity of reducing expenditures.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 1951 (as reduced under Sec. 1212)	$73, 942, 968
Budget estimates, 1952	73, 792, 208
Recommended for 1952	70, 341, 208
Reduction:	
1951 as reduced	3, 601, 760
1952 estimates	3, 451, 000

Through its constituent agencies, the Agricultural Research Administration carries on most of the Department's research in the physical and biological sciences, much of which is conducted in cooperation with the State agricultural experiment stations, and with other agencies, both public and private. The Administration also conducts those control and regulatory programs of the Department which involve the enforcement of plant and animal quarantine, meat inspection, and the control of diseases and insect pests of animals and plants.

Office of Administrator.—The sum of $560,000, a reduction of $27,500 in the amount available for 1951 and $27,000 in the 1952 estimates, is recommended in the interests of economy. The committee expects this reduction to be made in such a manner as to not interfere with the extension of the role of the advisory committees in the research programs of the Department.

Additional appropriation language has been included in the bill under this item to permit the construction of experimental farm houses for the use of dairy workers at the Agricultural Research Center, found necessary in order to meet the present man power shortage, and to give the Administrator more latitude in transferring research funds among the various bureaus under his direction as the defense effort may require.

Research on Agricultural Problems of Alaska.—The committee recommends $250,000 for 1952, a decrease of $30,000 below the 1951 appropriation and the 1952 budget estimates. Since approximately $50,000 is available to Alaska under the appropriation for the Office of Experiment Stations, this reduction appears advisable in the interest of economy.

Office of Experiment Stations.—The amount approved for 1952 provides $12,416,208 for payments to states and territories and $390,000 for salaries and expenses. This represents a reduction of $17,500 from the 1951 level of funds and is $47,500 below the 1952 estimates. Because of the extreme importance of this research to the future of agriculture and the defense effort, the committee feels it absolutely essential that that this activity be continued at substantially the 1951 level of operation. This organization, which has long been the backbone of the Department's research program, should not be disturbed, in view of the local viewpoint which it brings to bear on the research work of the Department.

Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics.—The sum of $1,350,000 is approved for 1952, a reduction of $133,100 in the level for 1951 and $132,500 in the estimates for 1952. The committee feels that some projects of this Bureau should be postponed during the current emergency.

Bureau of Animal Industry.—The amount recommended, $23,800,000, is $435,100 less than funds available in 1951 and $1,050,000 less than estimates for 1952. This reduction has been made primarily in the funds for animal research, which the committee believes can be curtailed in view of the emergency situation and the Federal financial deficit. The funds for meat inspection have been maintained at the level authorized for 1951 because of the importance of this work not only to the consumers of the country but to the armed forces. Language has been inserted in the bill to permit the employment of additional inspectors to meet work load increases from funds made available by those firms and establishments which care to finance such additional service. At the present time the packing plants are paying for all overtime required by increased volume. The new provision is essentially an extension of this already authorized practice.

Bureau of Dairy Industry.—The amount approved, $1,450,000, is a reduction of $139,500 below funds available for 1951 and $139,000 below the estimates for 1952. The committee feels that the work of this Bureau should continue on those projects which are of the most

direct value to the current defense effort. The reduction is recommended for this item in view of the need to curtail expenses wherever possible.

Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry.—The committee approves $7,200,000 for this Bureau for 1952, a reduction of approximately 10 percent from the appropriation level for 1951 and the budget estimates for 1952. The work being done by this Bureau in the field of food preservation and utilization and the development of new drugs and other life-saving agents is extremely important in the current emergency. The reduction, which is recommended in the interest of economy, will require a complete re-evaluation of the work of the Bureau and the elimination of those projects which are less important to the welfare of the country at this time.

Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils and Agricultural Engineering.—A total of $10,500,000 is recommended, $10,351,400 for the major research programs of the Bureau and $148,600 for the National Arboretum. This is a reduction of $344,000 from the program for 1951 and $285,000 from the estimate for 1952. Since our future wheat production is in serious danger, the committee feels that $50,000 of the funds provided herein could well be spent to study the problem resulting from two new races of stem rust discovered in this country for the first time in 1950.

The committee's attention has been called to a serious problem which has developed in the pecan-growing area in Oklahoma, where a new type of disease is seriously threatening the entire industry in this area. The committee feels that this matter should be given attention and that a specialist should be assigned temporarily to help the growers of this area meet this problem.

Another serious matter, which has had the careful consideration of the committee, is the need for the relocation or replacement of certain field facilities of the Department, particularly at Orlando, Fla., and Clifton, N. J. The members of the committee are fully convinced of the need and are fully sympathetic with efforts to correct the conditions. They are of the opinion, however, that such items cannot be appropriated for at this time in view of the present serious financial problem of the country. If the quarantine station at Clifton can be replaced within the amount received from sale of the present property, the committee would look with favor upon its relocation.

Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine.—A total of $12,425,000 is approved, $10,625,000 for salaries and expenses and $1,800,000 for the control of emergency outbreaks of insect and plant diseases. This is a reduction of $1,405,060 below the funds available for 1951 and $973,000 below the estimates for 1952. The committee feels that the funds recommended will permit continuation of the programs of the Bureau at the 1951 level of operation, provided the matters discussed below are given proper attention.

The committee has been particularly concerned with the operations and administration of this Bureau for the past several years. The original survey made by the investigative staff of the committee more than a year ago showed some very serious defects in its programs. A follow-up survey made last fall indicated that, while some improvements have been made, a great deal remains to be done to bring the activities up to the level of efficiency and effectiveness which should be expected. The committee has been assured by the new head of

the Bureau that a complete and thorough job of reorganization and housecleaning will be done during the next year, and the committee intends to follow up to make certain that the taxpayer is getting his money's worth from the funds expended for these programs. In order that it may be currently informed of the progress being made, it is requested that a report be furnished the committee at least quarterly during the coming fiscal year. Such a report should indicate the changes made in organization and operating methods, the number of employees eliminated and savings involved, the savings from reduction of office space, files, vehicles and other equipment, and the changes made in the Denver office.

The committee has never been fully satisfied with the extent of cooperation and funds received from State and other local organizations with respect to most of the control programs of the Bureau. An exception is the control of the pink boll worm where there are strong State laws requiring cooperation by farmers and others in the area which are enforced. All seed must be treated, cotton stalks must be destroyed by certain dates, and ginners and others in infected areas, are required to treat seed, remove waste and take other precautions at their own expense. In addition, when new outbreaks of sufficient danger occur, the production of cotton in a given area can be and frequently is prohibited for several years. There is a strict quarantine where needed. The expense of the control program last year was met with $1,201,159 of Federal funds and $10,559,933 of State and private funds.

This method of handling such programs could well be the model for the Bureau to use in reorganizing its other control programs. The Cotton Industry is now studying this setup to see if further improvement in this approach to the problem can be made. The first report of the committee indicates there is a much greater hope for obtaining the cooperation of the Republic of Mexico. Another development in this direction is being sponsored by the National Oil Wilt Research Committee, where it appears that the program is being sponsored and financed largely by local and private interests. The committee is of the opinion that all programs of the Bureau should be developed along these lines.

In addition, the committee seriously questions the advisability of continuing work on certain of the programs such as those concerning the Japanese Beetle, the Golden Nematode, and Hall Scale. Based on evidence received, many of the methods employed in eradicating various insects and plant diseases are questioned. In view of the recent outbreak of a new race of stem rust, which threatens our whole wheat crop, the committee feels that everything possible should be done to meet the problem. However, evidence obtained by the investigative staff indicates that in some States the cost of eliminating barberry bushes has been too costly with the present methods of the Bureau. The committee is of the opinion that the present approach is not working too satisfactorily and feels that changes must be made in methods of detection, that adequate State laws must be adopted and enforced, and that inducements such as premiums for location of plants must be considered. Testimony also raises the question as to whether or not the virus may be brought in from great distances by wind currents which may be as much a threat as local barberry bushes.

It is recommended that the Secretary make a special study of each control program during the next six months and submit a report to this committee covering the following points:

(*a*) Need for continuing program.

(*b*) Revision of methods of control.

(*c*) Efforts being made to increase non-Federal cooperation and contributions.

(*d*) Whether or not the program should be made contingent upon adequate State laws and enforcement of them.

The committee understands that the contingency fund for control of emergency and incipient outbreaks is available for all programs of the Bureau, including those provided for normally under the appropriation for salaries and expenses, where the outbreak is of epidemic proportions and could not have been anticipated in the regular estimates.

CONTROL OF FOREST PESTS

Appropriations, 1951 (as reduced under Sec. 1214)	$7, 158, 458
Budget estimates, 1952	9, 150, 000
Recommended for 1952	5, 000, 000
Reduction:	
1951 as reduced	2, 158, 458
1952 estimates	4, 150, 000

Activities financed from this appropriation include control operations designed to suppress or eradicate forest insect pests and diseases, and surveys to detect and appraise infestations of insect pests and tree diseases and to recommend protective measures. The survey work is primarily the responsibility of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, whereas the control programs are carried on jointly by Federal, State, and private agencies under the technical direction and leadership of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine and in cooperation with the Forest Service and five agencies of the Interior Department.

The sum of $5,000,000 has been recommended for this activity for the fiscal year 1952, $1,700,000 for the Forest Pest Control Act and $3,300,000 for White Pine Blister Rust. This amount is $2,158,458 less than funds available for 1951 and $4,150,000 below the estimates for 1952. Under the Forest Pest Control fund, $700,000 is provided to complete the Spruce budworm project, $500,000 is included for surveys and other control work, and $500,000 is available for contingencies and emergencies.

It is believed that further consolidations of field offices and reductions in supervisory levels in the White Pine Blister Rust program will permit the absorption of the reduction without any curtailment of program.

FOREST SERVICE

Appropriations, 1951 (as reduced under Sec. 1214)	$62, 101, 463
Budget estimates, 1952	70, 462, 000
Recommended for 1952	61, 634, 525
Reduction:	
1951 as reduced	466, 938
1952 estimates	8, 827, 475

The Forest Service is charged with responsibility for promoting the conservation and wise use of the country's forest and related watershed lands. It engages in three main lines of work: (1) management, pro-

tection and development of the National Forests, (2) cooperation with the States and private landowners in forest practices, reforestation and fire protection, and (3) forest and range research.

Salaries and expenses.—The committee recommends a total of $38,342,525, a reduction of $100,000 below funds available for 1951 and $2,657,475 below the 1952 estimates. The funds provided should permit the Forest Service to continue its activities at the 1951 level of operation. A reduction comparable to that for most other items of the Department has not been made here in view of the need to provide for increased timber sales resulting from the increased requirements of the defense effort. Since 1950, the demand for national forest stumpage has been increasing. Timber sales, which in the fiscal year 1950 amounted to $30.7 million dollars, are expected to increase to $40,000,000 in 1951 and around $50,000,000 in 1952.

In view of the importance of our timber resources to the National Defense Program, the committee feels that continued operation of existing field research facilities is necessary and expansion is desirable. Recognizing the need to expand the number of research units throughout the country despite the impossibility of providing additional funds, the committee has recommended for the past several years that the Forest Service develop a plan for operating the field research program on a cooperative basis, calling upon each State to provide funds to match those included in Federal appropriations. The committee feels this year that it is increasingly necessary that such a plan be developed, in view of the urgent need for additional funds for this purpose. Accordingly it has made provisions in the bill for the utilization of contributions from local sources to expand the number of facilities throughout the country and has recommended sufficient funds for 1952 to permit the continuation of those stations and research units now in existence. The committee feels that if this new authority is properly used, sufficient contributions can be developed to permit the agency, by re-working the allotment of funds, to provide research facilities in those areas where a portion of the financial burden can be assumed. Such a plan should enable the Forest Service to provide for the research unit in New Mexico authorized last year and to make provision for a research station in the sand land areas of the Southeastern United States now producing hardwoods, principally scrub oak, which have promise of providing a valuable source of tannic acid and a supply of wood for pulp and plastic manufacturing. The Department is urged to begin immediately developing a research program along the lines outlined above, and is requested to submit a special report by next January 1 to the committee concerning conditions prevailing in each State, action necessary to obtain contributions from State and local sources, and legislation recommended to put this plan into effect.

It is significant to note in connection with this appropriation that the Forest Service receives approximately $10,000,000 each year from sources beyond its regular appropriations. The major portion of these funds are used to improve the national forests.

Forest development roads and trails.—An appropriation of $11,500,000 is recommended, which represents substantially a continuation of the 1951 program. The committee has disallowed the increase of $6,000,000 requested for new road construction in the belief that the timber operators should provide the means of getting timber out

in connection with their logging operations. Since States receive 25 percent of timber receipts, Federal construction of roads which could be provided by timber operators not only increases Federal expenditures but also increases payments to States beyond the intent of the law. In recognition of the fact that some of the central roads in the national forests should possibly be constructed by the Federal government, an additional $2,500,000 was approved for this purpose in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951. It should be noted that the Forest Service has had in excess of $50,000,000 for this item during the past five years.

Acquisition of land—Weeks Act.—The committee recommends the full budget estimate of $100,000, a reduction of $150,000 below funds available for 1951. This nominal amount will permit the continuation of this program on a very modest basis, and will provide for the purchase of those areas of land most essential to watershed and timber protection.

Acquisition of land—Superior National Forest.—The amount recommended for 1952, $100,000, is $50,000 less than the 1951 appropriation and the 1952 budget estimate. The land purchase program of $500,000 authorized in the Act of June 22, 1948, contemplated completion of the program in approximately three years. To date $225,000 has been appropriated. While the amount recommended for 1952 will not permit completion within the period originally planned, it will permit continuation of the program on a modest basis, looking to eventual completion within a reasonable period of time.

Acquisition of land—Special Acts.—The budget estimate of $142,000 is recommended, a continuation of the program level which has been in effect for the past several years. This appropriation provides for the use of receipts from the national forests for the acquisition of land to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage.

State and private forestry cooperation.—The committee recommends $10,750,000 for 1952, $82,800 less than funds available for fiscal year 1951 and $70,000 less than 1952 estimates. This nominal reduction, which is made in the interests of economy, should not curtail any of the programs financed from this appropriation.

Cooperative range improvements.—The sum of $700,000 is recommended, a continuation of the amount available in 1951 and a reduction of $50,000 in the estimate for 1952. The budget proposal to change from an annual specific appropriation to an annual indefinite appropriation is not recommended. In view of the nature of this program, the committee believes that it should be handled on a cooperative basis with the States concerned and that amounts spent by the Federal Government should be matched from funds received from local sources. Accordingly, a provision is included in the bill to require that local contributions at least equal to Federal expenditures be made by States or other local public or private sources.

A supplemental appropriation of $1,351,150 for payments to 15 States to compensate them for a portion of grazing charges not collected by the Forest Service but used for construction and maintenance of range improvements has been considered by the committee in connection with this appropriation. Testimony received by the committee indicated that, while the Department withheld these funds improperly, the funds were expended on range improvements which resulted in increased returns to the States involved. The language

discussed above permits claims recognized by the Act of December 29, 1950, to be used as an offset by those States involved to the local contributions required.

FLOOD CONTROL

Appropriations, 1951	$13, 401, 575
Appropriations, 1951 (as reduced under Sec. 1214)	9, 201, 575
Budget estimates, 1952	8, 900, 000
Recommended for 1952	8, 000, 000
Reduction:	
1951 as reduced	1, 201, 575
1952 estimates	900, 000

This appropriation finances the preliminary examination and survey of water sheds authorized by Congress, the preparation of survey reports, and the installation of water shed improvement measures to retard runoff and water flow and to prevent erosion. The Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service have the primary responsibilities for this work. In view of the urgent need to carry these projects through to completion at an early date, the sum of $8,000,000 is approved for 1952. This is a reduction of $1,201,575 below the program for 1951 and $900,000 in the estimates for 1952. Since one of our major problems is the vast sums which are lost each year from floods, and since virtually no critical and strategic materials are involved in this work, the committee feels that the sum recommended is fully justified.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Appropriations, 1951 (as reduced under Sec. 1214)	$55, 467, 418
Budget estimates, 1952	54, 778, 000
Recommended for 1952	54, 463, 500
Reduction:	
1951 as reduced	1, 003, 918
1952 estimates	314, 500

The Soil Conservation Service appropriations cover activities carried on to conserve soil and water resources, establish a permanent and balanced agriculture, and reduce the hazards of flood and sedimentation. This work consists primarily of performing research on cause and correction of soil erosion and water loss, furnishing technical and other assistance to conservation districts throughout the country, developing and managing land utilization projects in areas of submarginal land, and conducting water conservation and utilization activities.

Salaries and expenses.—The budget estimate of $54,278,000 is approved for 1952, a reduction of $662,632 in the program for 1951. In view of the 150 new soil conservation districts added during the current fiscal year and the prospects of an additional 150 districts during 1952, the committee strongly supports the amount approved. It is expected that additional funds required to staff the new districts can be obtained by reductions in research and other programs financed from this appropriation.

The committee has disapproved the proposal contained in the budget to eliminate language which requires that expenditures for conservation research work in the Everglades region of Florida be matched by State or local funds because it is believed that a similar arrangement should be made for all research work of this Service. The Department is requested to study this matter during the next year and to make a special report at the hearings on the 1953 budget.

Water conservation and utilization projects.—The committee recommends $185,500 for this item for 1952, which is $341,286 below the funds available for 1951 and $314,500 below the estimate for 1952. The amount recommended is the same as funds available for 1951, excluding the carryover from 1950.

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 1951 (as reduced under Sec. 1214)	$470, 223, 500
Budget estimates 1952	473, 196, 000
Recommended for 1952	429, 100, 000
Reduction:	
1951 as reduced	41, 123, 500
1952 estimates	44, 096, 000

The Production and Marketing Administration includes the programs of the Department affecting production and marketing of agricultural commodities. The funds provided cover agricultural conservation, acreage allotments and marketing quotas, price support, marketing research, market news service, marketing regulatory activities, the sugar and school-lunch programs, and other "action" programs. To this Agency there has also been assigned the task of getting farmers to increase production and responsibility to assist in obtaining adequate supplies of fertilizer, farm machinery, and other items essential to increased farm production. This work is to be done largely within the amounts appropriated.

Conservation and use of agricultural land resources.—The committee recommends a total of $256,500,000 for this program for 1952, which is the appropriation amount for 1951, after the President's reduction made pursuant to Section 1214 of the 1951 Appropriation Act, and is a reduction of $28,500,000 below the estimate for 1952. The sum of $225,000,000 is recommended as the program authorization for the 1952 crop year, a reduction of $60,000,000 in the budget estimate. The limitations for Administrative expenses are approved in the amounts recommended, as the part-time workers in the field have the additional national-defense work mentioned above. The reductions for the coming year are recommended in view of the general reduction in expenditures being demanded of all Departments and agencies of the Government although a number of members of the committee feel that the amount might well be kept at the present level.

In approving funds for 1952 at the amount available after the President's reduction of last year, a majority of the committee believes that sufficient funds will be available to meet that part of the announced program which has been accepted and acted upon by the farmers participating in the program. The committee considers the amount announced last year as a flat commitment, however, and to the extent that funds have been committed and the program acted upon within the limits of such announcement, additional amounts may be made available from the Commodity Credit Corporation as provided by law to carry out the Government's obligation. Doubtless, the effect of this action will be evident by the time of Senate action and should be taken into consideration in fixing the final program to be announced for next year.

Beginning with the program for the 1952 crop year the committee urges that conservation practices of a permanent or quasi-permanent nature be stressed in order that funds expended will make the fullest possible contribution to the long range soil conservation program of the Department.

Agricultural Production Programs.—A total of $8,300,000 is recommended for 1952, $21,595,500 below the total funds available for 1951 and $11,700,000 below the estimate for 1952. The amount approved includes $5,500,000 for acreage allotments and marketing quotas on tobacco and peanuts, $300,000 to close out controls on cotton, and $2,500,000 to provide assistance on national defense problems involved in meeting expanded production needs. During the current fiscal year $2,725,000 was transferred to this appropriation from defense production appropriations, and the amount recommended will permit continuation at approximately the same level in 1952.

Sugar Act.—The committee recommends $70,000,000, an increase of $6,250,000 over the program for 1951 and a decrease of $3,300,000 in the estimates for 1952. Since the cost of this program is determined entirely by the volume of sugar production, the Congress has no control over funds required. During the past several years, amounts appropriated have been less than those actually required to meet these mandatory payments which has left an accumulation of liability on the Government. Sugar tax collections from which these funds are obtained have exceeded the amounts expended each year since the inauguration of this program, therefore such appropriation is not actually a charge against Agriculture.

National School Lunch.—The budget estimate of $83,500,000, the amount available in 1951, is recommended for the coming fiscal year. Despite the many appeals for more funds to meet the constantly rising food costs and increasing school enrollments, the committee does not feel that the program can be increased over 1951, in view of the urgent need for economy.

Marketing Services.—The committee recommends a total of $10,800,000, a reduction of $596,000 in the estimates for 1952. The urgency of many of the specific items of increase requested is recognized and the committee feels that all of them should be given careful consideration in re-programing within the funds finally appropriated, perhaps by reducing the research activities for the next year. Although additional funds requested for inspection and classing activities are not provided for specifically, new language is included in the bill to permit the transfer of funds to this appropriation to meet the increased need. This proviso is similar to one included in the bill in 1950, which provided additional funds for the mandatory classing and inspection work involved in placing commodities under loan with the Commodity Credit Corporation. The new language will make such funds available on the basis of work done on commodities for producers who are eligible to obtain price support.

COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

Appropriations, 1951 (as reduced under Sec. 1214)	$650,000
Budget estimates, 1952	650,000
Recommended for 1952	650,000

The major objectives of this appropriation are to prevent commodity price manipulation and corners, to prevent dissemination of false and misleading information affecting commodity prices, to protect hedgers against fraud and manipulative practices, to insure proper use of funds by brokers, and to provide information to the public regarding trading operations and contract markets.

The budget estimate, which is the same amount as is available for fiscal year 1951, is recommended for 1952. In view of the urgent

need to control speculation in agricultural commodities during the present national emergency and in view of the excellent job being done by this organization, the committee feels that the work should be continued at the 1951 level.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

Appropriations, 1951 (as reduced under Sec. 1214)	$7,095,625
Budget estimates, 1952	8,200,000
Recommended for 1952	8,000,000
Increase: 1951, as reduced	904,375
Decrease: 1952 estimates	200,000

The crop insurance program is designed to alleviate the economic distress caused by crop failures due to unavoidable causes, by guaranteeing production either in terms of commodities or money. All insurance programs are being expanded gradually to assure successful operation. Insurance is being offered in the crop year 1951 in a total of 877 counties on wheat, cotton, flax, corn, tobacco, bean, and multiple crops.

The committee recommends a total of $8,000,000 for 1952, an increase of $904,375 over funds available for 1951 and a reduction of $200,000 in the estimate for 1952. In view of the desirability of expanding the number of participants in this program to increase its effectiveness, a substantial increase for contract sales and servicing work appears advisable. In addition, increased funds are necessary to permit inspection, loss adjustment, and premium collections required to protect those contracts now in effect.

The committee requests that this organization investigate the possibility of developing closer coordination with the Farmers Home Administration, the Farm Credit Administration, and other agencies of the Department, as well as the possibility of utilizing these organizations to a larger extent in the program. The committee requests that a full report on this study be submitted to it not later than next January 1.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 1951 (as reduced under Sec. 1214)	$8,421,350
Budget estimates, 1952	8,500,000
Recommended for 1952	7,750,000
Reduction:	
1951 as reduced	671,350
1952 estimates	750,000

The funds authorized for this program provide for loans to cooperative associations and other appropriate organizations for the extension of central station electric and telephone service to unserved rural people. Loans are self-liquidating within a period of not to exceed 35 years and bear interest at the rate of 2 percent. Each year the collections far exceed new loans. The Administration also gives technical review and approval to construction plans, approves completed construction, furnishes assistance on business management matters, and conducts periodic audits of the records of borrowers.

The committee recommends the budget estimate of $109,000,000 for loan funds, $100,000,000 for the electrification program and $9,000,000 for the telephone program, which is $188,000,000 less than funds available for the current fiscal year. The sum of $7,750,000 is recommended for salaries and expenses, a reduction of $671,350 from the 1951 level and a reduction of $750,000 in the 1952 estimates.

Since the electrification program has now reached some 86 percent of all farms in the United States, it will undoubtedly reduce in size in the future, and the administrative work will be reduced accordingly. Information furnished the committee indicates that new electrification applications for the next fiscal year will run approximately $145,000,000 and that a carryover of approximately $45,000,000 of funds authorized for 1951 will be available.

Including the amount approved for 1952, a total of $66,500,000 has been provided for the rural telephone program. This amount appears to be sufficient to cover all applications received through the current date.

In view of the decrease recommended in the loan funds for the electrification and telephone programs, a reduction is proposed for salaries and expenses. While a larger reduction might be indicated from the decrease in loan authorizations for 1952, it is recognized that a certain residue of work remains from loans made during prior years which must be handled on a continuing basis, regardless of the size of loan authorizations for ensuing fiscal years. Information presented to the committee indicates that the workload involved in the operation and maintenance of existing facilities, and auditing, collecting and accounting for existing contracts will increase in 1952, despite the decrease in the size of the new loan program.

FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 1951 (as reduced under Sec. 1214)	$28, 599, 752
Budget estimates, 1952	29, 900, 000
Recommended for 1952	27, 500, 000
Reduction:	
1951 as reduced	1, 099, 752
1952 estimates	2, 400, 000

The appropriation and loan funds required under this heading cover the following: (1) farm ownership and housing loans to enlarge or develop family size farms, (2) production and subsistence loans for farm operating expenses, (3) loans for the construction, repair, or improvement of water facilities, and (4) emergency loans required as the result of a serious production disaster. Supervisory assistance in planning and carrying out sound operations is provided all borrowers.

The committee has approved loan funds in the amount of $142,250,000, and recommends $27,500,000 for salaries and expenses. No appropriation is recommended for grants for farm housing construction for which $400,000 was available for 1951 and $200,000 was requested for 1952. The loan authorization represents a reduction of $5,250,000 below the program level for 1951 and is $10,750,000 less than the estimates for 1952. The funds recommended for salaries and expenses are $699,752 below the funds available for 1951 and $2,200,000 below the estimate for 1952.

The increase of $250,000 for water facilities loans is believed to be fully justified, in view of the increasing demand for such loans from veterans who do not have other sources of credit for land leveling and the installation of necessary water facilities, and because this increase involves loans which are fully repaid and represent no direct cost to the government. While the decrease in administrative funds may seem unduly drastic, the committee has every reason to believe that the usually fine administration of this agency will enable it to absorb the reduction with no serious impairment of its program. The

operation of this agency in recent years under the present management merits the commendation of the Congress.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 1951 (as reduced under Sec. 1214)	$2, 904, 700
Budget estimates, 1952	2, 905, 000
Recommended for 1952	2, 625, 000
Reduction:	
1951 as reduced	279, 700
1952 estimates	280, 000

The Farm Credit Administration is charged with the responsibility of supervising and coordinating the Farm Credit System to provide a source of credit at all times to farmers and farmers' cooperatives. Its services are provided through the following basic institutions: Federal land banks and national farm loan associations, Federal intermediate credit banks, production credit corporations and associations, banks for cooperatives, and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

A total of $2,625,000 is recommended for operating expenses of this organization, of which $300,000 is to be obtained by direct appropriation and $2,325,000 is to be derived from assessments against member institutions to cover the cost of supervision, facilities, examinations, and other services furnished to such agencies. Since the amount recommended, which is a reduction of $279,700 below the amount available for 1951 and is $280,000 below the estimate for 1952, is used entirely for research activities for the benefit of cooperatives, the committee feels that additional funds should be provided by the benefitting organizations.

The committee has been favorably impressed for the past several years with the unusually fine work which the Farm Credit Administration has done in improving its operations and administration, and wishes to commend the Governor for the excellent manner in which this has been done.

EXTENSION SERVICE

Appropriations, 1951 (as reduced under Sec. 1214)	$27, 991, 998
Budget estimates, 1952	28, 052, 088
Recommended for 1952	28, 015, 000
Increase: 1951 as reduced	23, 002
Reduction: 1952 estimates	37, 088

The activities financed from these appropriations are directed toward the improvement of income, health, family living, and educational and recreational facilities among rural people. Funds are distributed to each State, Alaska, Puerto Rico and Hawaii, partly on the basis of the rural population and the farm population. State and others contribute 58 percent of the funds expended for this work.

The committee recommends a total of $28,015,000, which includes $27,135,000 for payments to States and Territories and $880,000 for salaries and expenses. The amount approved for payments to States includes approximately half of the increase requested to extend the Bankhead-Flanagan Act to the Territory of Puerto Rico. This additional money will permit the intensification of efforts to teach the people of Puerto Rico the nutritive value of native foods and to stimulate the production of more food products for home use, and will help to extend the 4–H club work in this area. The nominal reduction in salaries and expenses is recommended in view of the need for reductions in non-defense appropriations.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Appropriations, 1951 (as reduced under Sec. 1214)	$2, 157, 200
Budget estimates, 1952	2, 191, 250
Recommended for 1952	2, 157, 200
Reduction: 1952 estimates	34, 050

This appropriation provides for the Secretary, his immediate staff and the Offices of Personnel, Budget and Finance, Plant and Operations and Hearing Examiners.

The sum of $2,157,200 is recommended for this office for 1952, a continuation of the amount available for 1951 and a reduction of $34,050 from the estimates for 1952. In view of the increasing responsibilities being placed on the Secretary and his immediate staff in providing special representation for Agriculture before Federal boards and agencies concerned with priorities, allocations, requisitioning, expansion of productive capacity and supply, the committee feels that the staff of this office should be maintained at the level authorized for 1951. Because of the probability that no additional funds for this work will be available from defense appropriations in 1952, this appropriation must be sufficient to enable the Secretary and his staff to provide proper representation before the Selective Service System and military and defense agencies to assure adequate manpower and materials for agriculture.

OFFICE OF SOLICITOR

Appropriations, 1951 (as reduced under Sec. 1214)	$2, 552, 100
Budget estimates, 1951	2, 463, 000
Recommended for 1952	2, 200, 000
Reduction:	
1951 as reduced	352, 100
1952 estimates	263, 000

The Solicitor's Office, as the central law office of the Department of Agriculture, performs the legal work arising from all of its activities and bureaus.

The amount recommended for this office for 1952, $2,200,000, is $352,100 below the amounts available for 1951 and $263,000 below the estimate for 1952. This decrease is based on the reductions recommended in certain of the major programs of the Department serviced by this Office, including the Commodity Credit Corporation and the REA.

OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

Appropriations, 1951 (as reduced under Sec. 1214)	$645, 000
Budget estimates, 1952	600, 000
Recommended for 1952	600, 000
Reduction: 1951 as reduced	45, 000

Through regular and special reports from agricultural attaches abroad and specialists on temporary assignment in other countries, and by exchange of information with foreign governments and international agricultural organizations, this Office obtains current facts that are used to advise American farmers and fusiness firms concerning important agricultural developments abroad. It also directs training programs for foreign agricultural leaders brought to this country and furnishes technical and scientific services to cooperating foreign countries on agricultural problems.

In view of the small size of this appropriation and the fact that additional responsibilities are being assigned to this office as the international picture becomes more complicated, the committee feels that reductions comparable to those made generally throughout the

bill in the interests of economy should not be made here. Accordingly, the budget estimate of $600,000 is approved, a reduction of $45,000 below funds available for 1951.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

Appropriations, 1951 (as reduced under Sec. 1214)	$1, 274, 600
Budget estimates, 1952	1, 271, 000
Recommended for 1952	1, 271, 000
Reduction: 1951 as reduced	3, 600

The office financed from this appropriation has general direction and supervision over all publications and other information activities of the Department. It publishes the Yearbook of Agriculture, the annual report of the Secretary, farmers bulletins and other documents.

The budget estimate of $1,271,000 is recommended for this office for 1952, a continuation of the 1951 level of operation. The full estimate is approved in view of the fine work being done by this organization, because printing costs have increased nearly 200 percent during the past few years, and because this office has made every effort to meet additional requirements within funds available through re-evaluation of its programs and elimination of less essential work.

LIBRARY

Appropriations, 1951 (as reduced under Sec. 1214)	$702, 593
Budget estimates, 1952	700, 000
Recommended for 1952	700, 000
Reduction: 1951 as reduced	2, 593

The Library makes available to the research workers of the Department, the State agricultural colleges, and the general public all published material on agriculture. By law and under cooperative arrangement with the Library of Congress, it serves as the National Agricultural Library.

The full estimate of $700,000 is recommended, a reduction of $2,593 below the 1951 level, in view of the increase in printing costs of nearly 200 percent and the steadily increasing use being made of this service. Information received confidentially indicates that this library is operating very efficiently in comparison with other libraries in the Federal Government.

SPECIAL ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 1951 (as reduced under Sec. 1214)	$399, 000
Budget estimates, 1952	33, 400, 000
Recommended for 1952	450, 000
Increase: 1951 as reduced	51, 000
Decrease: 1952 estimates	32, 950, 000

Research on strategic and critical materials.—This appropriation is for the purpose of enabling the Department to carry out its assigned responsibilities under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of 1946, which authorizes and directs the Department to make investigations into the feasibility of developing domestic sources of supplies of agricultural material or substitutes determined to be strategic and critical. The amount recommended for 1952 is $450,000, an increase of $51,000 over the funds for 1951 and a decrease of $250,000 in the estimate for 1952. It will cover to a small extent the increases requested for research on the extraction of tannin from canaigre, research on specific applications of strategic oils, and research on hard fiber substitutes for cordage. Because of the importance of this work to the defense effort, the committee feels that a nominal increase over the 1951 appropriation should be allowed.

Eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals.—Beginning with the fiscal year 1948, annual appropriation acts for the Department have authorized the Secretary to transfer from any funds available to the Department amounts necessary to finance the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, subject to later reimbursement. Based on this authorization, transfers have been made from funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the conduct of the program and appropriations for repayments of activities in 1948 and 1949 have been made. The budget for 1952 includes $32,700,000 to permit the reimbursement of the Commodity Credit Corporation for expenses incurred through June 30, 1950. In view of the fact that this is not a regular activity of the Department, the committee recommends that the funds be provided by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to cancel notes issued by the Corporation in the amount of $32,700,000, in lieu of making a direct appropriation.

The present outlook is favorable for complete eradication of this disease in Mexico. The expenditures in 1951, for which funds will be requested in the 1953 budget, are expected to be considerably less than those in 1950 and prior years, in view of the termination of vaccine production and mass vaccinations in July 1950. It is impossible to determine definitely when this program can be finally terminated, although information furnished the committee indicates that United States personnel may be withdrawn entirely within the next several years if no further serious outbreaks develop.

International Wheat Agreement.—The International Wheat Agreement, which was ratified by the United States Senate on June 13, 1949, in the opinion of the committee is a part of our foreign policy and not a regular activity of the Department. The agreement authorizes the use of Commodity Credit Corporation funds to make payments called for in such agreement. This the CCC has done and the budget estimate for 1952 proposes that $76,808,000 be transferred from the permanent appropriation "Removal of surplus agricultural commodities" as reimbursement.

In view of the feeling of the committee that this program is primarily a part of our foreign policy and in view of the advisability of maintaining the Section 32 funds intact as provided by law, the bill provides that this item be handled by cancellation of notes issued by the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury, rather than through the transfer proposed.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Commodity Credit Corporation.—The committee recommends $15,000,000 for the administrative expenses of this organization for 1952, which is $5,200,000 below the estimates for 1952 and $4,100,000 less than total funds for 1951, including the $2,750,000 included in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951. This reduction is believed justified in view of the current outlook for agriculture and the probable change from surpluses to shortages in many of the commodities normally handled by the corporation. On the other hand, a reduction below the amount recommended appears inadvisable in view of the uncertainty of the agricultural picture for next year and the need to maintain a basic organization which can meet the situation if current trends are reversed. In this connection it should be remembered that the responsibilities of the Corporation are mandatory under the law and must be met as the situation demands. It should also

be pointed out that this is a limitation on the use of corporation funds rather than a direct appropriation.

Farm Credit Administration member institutions.—The budget estimates for the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, the Federal intermediate credit banks, and the production credit corporations are approved in view of the fine record which these organizations have made in reducing their administrative costs in the past. The amounts approved represent a continuation of the funds authorized for 1951, except for the reduction of $180,000 proposed for the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. It should be noted that these are limitations on the use of corporate funds of these institutions and not direct annual appropriations.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The general provisions contained in this bill are essentially the same as those which have been carried for the past several years. Several sections providing for special administrative needs have been eliminated in view of the enactment of Public Law 830, approved September 23, 1950. Two new sections have been added to correct certain administrative practices of the Department which are not conducive to efficient and economical administration.

One provision limits the paying of a 25 percent differential in territories of the United States to resident citizens of the continental United States. Under existing law, a native of Puerto Rico, for instance, who is occupying a regular classified position, receives 25 percent more than an employee performing the same duties in the United States. Evidence presented to the committee indicates that low-grade clerks in many cases are receiving salaries in excess of local business officials and professional men.

The other provision inserted in the bill under this heading would give the Department more latitude in the employment of persons for emergency forest fire fighting, pest control and the handling of animals. It has been indicated to the committee that the results of research work on dairy cattle for example are less satisfactory and more expensive under existing regulations, than they would be if hours of work could be arranged on the most suitable basis.

LIMITATIONS AND LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

The following limitations and legislative provisions not heretofore carried in any appropriation act are included in the bill:

On page 5, line 25, in connection with the Office of the Administrator, Agricultural Research Administration:

Provided further, That not to exceed 7 per centum of the funds of any research appropriation of the Agricultural Research Administration, including the appropriation for the Office of the Administrator, may be transferred by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary, to any other such research appropriation in order to provide for a more effective research program: Provided, however, that no appropriation may be increased more than 7 percentum by such transfers.

On page 23, line 4, in connection with Forest research:

Provided, That hereafter funds may be received from any State, other political subdivision, organization, or individual for the purpose of establishing or operating any forest research facility located within the United States, its Territories, or possessions.

On page 26, line 18, in connection with Cooperative Range Improvements:

Provided, That hereafter no part of the appropriation for "Cooperative Range Improvements" shall be expended in any national forest until funds or other contributions at

least equal to such expenditures are made available by States or other local public or private sources, except that claims recognized by the Act of December 29, 1950, shall be accepted as contributions for the purposes of this section.

On page 30, line 19, in connection with the Soil Conservation Service:

Provided further, That not to exceed $265,000 of funds authorized for fiscal year 1951 for development of land utilization projects may remain available until expended.

On page 37, line 18, in connection with Marketing Services:

Provided, That hereafter appropriations available for classing or grading any agricultural commodity without charge to the producers thereof may be reimbursed from nonadministrative funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the cost of classing or grading any such commodity for producers who are eligible to obtain Commodity Credit Corporation price support.

On page 40, line 19, in connection with the Farmers Home Administration:

and, hereafter, such sums annually for the purposes of this paragraph as the Congress may determine by provision in appropriation acts,

On page 49, line 21, in connection with the Eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and other contagious diseases of animals and poultry:

Provided further, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury by cancelling notes issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury in the amount of $32,700,000 for funds transferred and expenses incurred under this head through fiscal year 1950 pursuant to authority granted in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1950.

On page 50, line 6, in connection with the International Wheat Agreement:

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury by cancelling notes issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury in the amount of $76,808,000 for the net costs during the fiscal year 1950 under the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C. 1641–1642).

On page 55, line 19, in connection with the general provisions:

No part of the funds made available by this Act may be used to compensate any person for employment in the Federal service outside the continental limits of the United States at a rate higher than is paid for comparable work in the Federal service within the continental limits of the United States, other than a person who was a resident citizen of the continental United States at the date of his appointment to a position outside the continental limits of the United States and has had continuous employment in the Federal service (except as interrupted by service in the Armed Forces of the United States) from the date of such appointment.

On page 56, line 7, in connection with general provisions:

Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Department is hereby authorized hereafter to employ or otherwise contract with persons at regular rates of pay for necessary hours of work for emergency forest fire fighting and pest control and for handling of animals, including dairy cattle, without regard to Sundays, Federal holidays, and the regular work week.

COMPLIANCE WITH CLAUSE 2 (A) OF RULE XIII

PENDING BILL	EXISTING LAW
On page 11, lines 7 through 11:	
Provided, That hereafter reimbursement may be made by any person, firm, or organization for the expenses of meat inspection in excess of those which can be met from the amount appropriated for such purposes each year.	The cost of inspection rendered on and after July 1, 1948, under the requirements of laws relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat food products shall be borne by the United States except the cost of overtime pursuant to section 394 of Title 7. (Act of June 5, 1948, 21 U. S. C. 98.)

PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951	Estimates, 1952	Increase or decrease
Payments to school funds, Arizona and New Mexico	$71, 930	$71, 930	
Expenses and refunds, brush disposal	1, 400, 000	1, 400, 000	
Payments to Minnesota, national forest fund	45, 000	45, 000	
Payments to States and Territories, national forest fund	8, 372, 747	10, 354, 017	$1, 981, 270
Roads and trails for States, national forest fund	3, 350, 379	4, 141, 607	791, 228
Payments due counties and refunds, submarginal land program	240, 000	240, 000	
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities	111, 192, 249	[1] 150, 000, 000	38, 807, 751
Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act fund	300, 000	350, 000	50, 000
Cooperative agricultural extension work	4, 704, 710	4, 704, 710	
Replacement of personal property sold	855, 000	870, 000	15, 000
Net total, permanent appropriation	130, 532, 015	172, 177, 264	41, 645, 249

[1] Includes $76,808,000 proposed in budget for transfer to International Wheat Agreement.

TRUST FUNDS

[Not a charge against revenues]

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951	Estimates, 1952	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Animal Industry: Expenses and refunds, inspection and certification of canned wet animal foods	$100, 000	$100, 000	
Forest Service:			
Cooperative work	4, 500, 000	4, 500, 000	
State rural rehabilitation corporation funds	13, 651	13, 651	
Soil Conservation Service:			
Operation and maintenance, water distribution systems, water conservation and utilization projects	9, 800	9, 800	
Payments in lieu of taxes and operation and maintenance costs, water conservation and utilization projects	26, 000	19, 000	−$7, 000
Technical services and other assistance, agricultural conservation program	200, 000	200, 000	
Production and Marketing Administration:			
Expenses and refunds, inspection and grading of farm products	5, 706, 700	5, 800, 000	+93, 300
Indemnity fund, county associations	500	500	
Undistributed cotton price adjustment payments	100	100	

TRUST FUNDS—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations 1951	Estimates, 1952	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Farmers Home Administration:			
Liquidation of deposits, lease, and purchase contracts	$16, 000	$14, 000	−$2, 000
State rural rehabilitation funds and new agreements	9, 800, 000	7, 000, 000	−2, 800, 000
Miscellaneous contributed funds	589, 450	533, 000	−56, 450
Return of excess deposits for reduction of photographs, mosaics, and maps	46, 360	200	−46, 160
Total, trust funds	21, 008, 561	18, 190, 251	−2, 818, 310

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

(TITLE III)

Agency and item	Authorizations, 1951	Estimates, 1952	Recommended in bill for 1952	Bill compared with—	
				1951 authorizations	1952 estimates
Commodity Credit Corporation	$16, 350, 000	$20, 200, 000	$15, 000, 000	—$1, 350, 000	—$5, 200, 000
FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION					
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	1, 280, 000	1, 100, 000	1, 100, 000	—180, 000	
Federal Intermediate Credit Banks	1, 496, 000	1, 496, 000	1, 496, 000		
Production Credit Corporations	1, 358, 000	1, 358, 000	1, 358, 000		
Total, administrative expense limitations	20, 484, 000	24, 154, 000	18, 954, 000	—1, 530, 000	—5, 200, 000

LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS

(TITLE I)

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951		Estimates, 1952	Recommended in bill for 1952	Bill compared with—	
	Specific amounts	As reduced under sec. 1214			1951, as reduced under sec. 1214	1952 estimates
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION						
Farm ownership and farm housing	[1] $65,000,000	[1] $40,500,000	$38,000,000	$38,000,000	−$2,500,000	----------
Production and subsistence	[2] 103,000,000	[2] 103,000,000	110,000,000	100,000,000	−3,000,000	−$10,000,000
Water facilities	4,000,000	4,000,000	5,000,000	4,250,000	250,000	−750,000
Total, Farmers Home Administration	172,000,000	147,500,000	153,000,000	142,250,000	−5,250,000	−10,750,000
RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION						
Rural electrification [3]	350,000,000	264,500,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	−164,500,000	----------
Rural telephone [4]	32,500,000	32,500,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	−23,500,000	----------
Total, Rural Electrification Administration	382,500,000	297,000,000	109,000,000	109,000,000	−188,000,000	----------
Total, loan authorizations	554,500,000	444,500,000	262,000,000	251,250,000	−193,250,000	−10,750,000

[1] In addition prior year balance of $7,134,975 available.
[2] Includes $18,000,000 authorized in Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.
[3] Due to carry-over of funds from prior years, a loan program of $284,000,000 is planned for 1951 and $220,000,000 for 1952.
[4] Due to carry-over of funds from prior years, a loan program of $40,000,000 is planned for 1951 and $23,073,500 for 1952.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1951, AMOUNTS AS REDUCED UNDER SEC. 1214 (GENERAL REDUCTION OF $550,000,000 IN GENERAL APPROPRIATION ACT, 1951), ESTIMATES FOR 1952, AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1952

TITLE I—REGULAR ACTIVITIES

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951		Estimates, 1952	Recommended in bill for 1952	Bill compared with—	
	Specific amounts	As reduced under sec. 1214			1951, as reduced under sec. 1214	1952 estimates
Research and Marketing Act of 1946	$6, 000, 000	$5, 932, 000	$5, 500, 000	$4, 700, 000	−$1, 232, 000	−$800, 000
BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS						
Economic investigations	[1] 2, 621, 000	[1] 2, 556, 000	2, 529, 000	2, 150, 000	−406, 000	−379, 000
Crop and livestock estimates	[2] 2, 922, 400	[2] 2, 922, 400	2, 866, 000	2, 850, 000	−72, 400	−16, 000
Total, Bureau of Agricultural Economics	5, 543, 400	5, 478, 400	5, 395, 000	5, 000, 000	−478, 400	−395, 000
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION						
Office of Administrator	592, 500	587, 500	587, 000	560, 000	−27, 500	−27, 000
Working capital fund, Agriculture Research Center	300, 000	300, 000	----------	----------	−300, 000	----------
Research on agricultural problems of Alaska	280, 000	280, 000	280, 000	250, 000	−30, 000	−30, 000
Office of Experiment Stations:						
Payments to States, etc	12, 416, 208	12, 416, 208	12, 453, 708	12, 416, 208	----------	−37, 500
Salaries and expenses	412, 500	407, 500	400, 000	390, 000	−17, 500	−10, 000
Total, Office of Experiment Stations	12, 828, 708	12, 823, 708	12, 853, 708	12, 806, 208	−17, 500	−47, 500

Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics	1, 498, 100	1, 483, 100	1, 482, 500	1, 350, 000	−133, 100	−132, 500
Bureau of Animal Industry:						
Salaries and expenses:						
Animal research	3, 617, 200	3, 528, 200	3, 539, 400	3, 200, 700	−327, 500	−338, 700
Animal disease control and eradication	7, 949, 300	7, 907, 300	7, 868, 000	7, 750, 000	−157, 300	−118, 000
Marketing agreements, hog cholera virus and serum			49, 300	49, 300	49, 300	
Meat inspection	12, 799, 600	12, 799, 600	13, 393, 300	12, 800, 000	400	−593, 300
Total, Bureau of Animal Industry	24, 366, 100	24, 235, 100	24, 850, 000	23, 800, 000	−435, 100	−1, 050, 000
Bureau of Dairy Industry	1, 617, 000	1, 589, 500	1, 589, 000	1, 450, 000	−139, 500	−139, 000
Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry	8, 100, 000	7, 970, 000	7, 967, 000	7, 200, 000	−770, 000	−767, 000
Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils and Agricultural Engineering:						
Plant, soil, and agricultural engineering research	[3] 10, 915, 600	[3] 10, 695, 350	10, 636, 400	10, 351, 400	−343, 950	−285, 000
National Arboretum	152, 700	148, 650	148, 600	148, 600	−50	
Total, Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils and Agricultural Engineering	11, 068, 300	10, 844, 000	10, 785, 000	10, 500, 000	−344, 000	−285, 000

[1] Includes $21,000 allocated from "Expenses of defense production, 1951."
[2] Includes $18,400 allocated from "Expenses of defense production, 1951."
[3] Includes $100,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951, amounts as reduced under sec. 1214 (general reduction of $550,000,000 in General Appropriation Act, 1951), estimates for 1952, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1952—Continued

TITLE I—REGULAR ACTIVITIES—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951		Estimates, 1952	Recommended in bill for 1952	Bill compared with—	
	Specific amounts	As reduced under sec. 1214			1951, as reduced under sec. 1214	1952 estimates
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION—continued						
Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine:						
Salaries and expenses:						
Insect investigations	$4, 106, 800	$4, 061, 300	$3, 908, 000	$3, 525, 000	—$536, 300	—$383, 000
Insect and plant-disease control	4, 938, 500	4, 834, 500	4, 760, 000	4, 500, 000	—334, 500	—260, 000
Plant quarantines	2, 426, 200	2, 388, 500	2, 667, 000	2, 600, 000	211, 500	—67, 000
Total. salaries and expenses	11, 471, 500	11, 284, 300	11, 335, 000	10, 625, 000	—659, 300	—710, 000
Control of emergency outbreaks of insect and plant diseases	[4] 2, 545, 760	[4] 2, 545, 760	2, 063, 000	1, 800, 000	—745, 760	—263, 000
Total, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine	14, 017, 260	13, 830, 060	13, 398, 000	12, 425, 000	—1, 405, 060	—973, 000
Total, Agricultural Research Administration	74, 667, 968	73, 942, 968	73, 792, 208	70, 341, 208	—3, 601, 760	—3, 451, 000
CONTROL OF FOREST PESTS						
Forest Pest Control Act	[5] 3, 729, 458	[5] 3, 729, 458	5, 743, 000	1, 700, 000	—2, 029, 458	—4, 043, 000

White pine blister rust	3, 489, 750	3, 429, 000	3, 407, 000	3, 300, 000	−129, 000	−107, 000
Total, control of forest pests	7, 219, 208	7, 158, 458	9, 150, 000	5, 000, 000	−2, 158, 458	−4, 150, 000
FOREST SERVICE						
Salaries and expenses:						
National forest protection and management	[6] 27, 555, 025	[6] 27, 222, 025	29, 655, 000	27, 122, 025	−100, 000	−2, 532, 975
Fighting forest fires	6, 000, 000	6, 000, 000	6, 000, 000	6, 000, 000		
Forest research	5, 317, 500	5, 220, 500	5, 345, 000	5, 220, 500		−124, 500
Total, salaries and expenses	38, 872, 525	38, 442, 525	41, 000, 000	38, 342, 525	−100, 000	−2, 657, 475
Forest development roads and trails	[7] 11, 584, 138	[7] 11, 584, 138	17, 500, 000	11, 500, 000	−84, 138	−6, 000, 000
Acquisition of lands for national forests:						
Weeks Act	300, 000	250, 000	100, 000	100, 000	−150, 000	
Superior National Forest	150, 000	150, 000	150, 000	100, 000	−50, 000	−50, 000
Special acts	142, 000	142, 000	142, 000	142, 000		
State and private forestry cooperation	10, 867, 800	10, 832, 800	10, 820, 000	10, 750, 000	−82, 800	−70, 000
Cooperative range improvements	700, 000	700, 000	750, 000	700, 000		−50, 000
Total, Forest Service	62, 616, 463	62, 101, 463	70, 462, 000	61, 634, 525	−466, 938	−8, 827, 475
Flood control	[8] 13, 401, 575	[8] 9, 201, 575	8, 900, 000	8, 000, 000	−1, 201, 575	−900, 000

[4] Includes carry-over of $445,760 from fiscal year 1950.
[5] Includes carry-over of $2,079,458 from fiscal year 1950.
[6] Includes $100,000 allocated from "Expenses of defense production, 1951."
[7] Includes carry-over of $1,146,638 from fiscal year 1950.
[8] Includes carry-over of $3,088,775 from fiscal year 1950.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951, amounts as reduced under sec. 1214 (general reduction of $550,000,000 in General Appropriation Act, 1951), estimates for 1952, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1952—Continued

TITLE I—REGULAR ACTIVITIES—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951		Estimates, 1952	Recommended in bill for 1952	Bill compared with—	
	Specific amounts	As reduced under sec. 1214			1951, as reduced under sec. 1214	1952 estimates
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE						
Salaries and expenses	$55, 460, 632	$54, 940, 632	$54, 278, 000	$54, 278, 000	−$662, 632	
Water conservation and utilization projects	[9] 841, 286	[9] 526, 786	500, 000	185, 500	−341, 286	−$314, 500
Total, Soil Conservation Service	56, 301, 918	55, 467, 418	54, 778, 000	54, 463, 500	−1, 003, 918	−314, 500
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION						
Conservation and use of agricultural land resources	[10] 308, 250, 000	[10] 282, 250, 000	285, 000, 000	256, 500, 000	−25, 750, 000	−28, 500, 000
Agricultural production programs [11]	[12] 36, 395, 500	[12] 29, 895, 500	20, 000, 000	8, 300, 000	−21, 595, 500	−11, 700, 000
Sugar Act	63, 750, 000	63, 750, 000	73, 300, 000	70, 000, 000	6, 250, 000	−3, 300, 000
National school lunch	83, 500, 000	83, 500, 000	83, 500, 000	83, 500, 000		
Marketing services	10, 838, 000	10, 828, 000	11, 396, 000	10, 800, 000	−28, 000	−596, 000
Total, Production and Marketing Administration	502, 733, 500	470, 223, 500	473, 196, 000	429, 100, 000	−41, 123, 500	−44, 096, 000

Commodity Exchange Authority	650, 000	650, 000	650, 000	650, 000		
Federal Crop Insurance (administrative expenses)	7, 203, 625	7, 095, 625	8, 200, 000	8, 000, 000	904, 375	−200, 000
Rural Electrification Administration (salaries and expenses)	8, 549, 600	8, 421, 350	8, 500, 000	7, 750, 000	−671, 350	−750, 000
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION						
Grants	650, 000	400, 000	200, 000		−400, 000	−200, 000
Salaries and expenses	28, 499, 752	28, 199, 752	29, 700, 000	27, 500, 000	−699, 752	−2, 200, 000
Total, Farmers Home Administration	29, 149, 752	28, 599, 752	29, 900, 000	27, 500, 000	−1, 099, 752	−2, 400, 000
FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION						
Direct appropriation	584, 700	579, 700	580, 000	300, 000	−279, 700	−280, 000
Assessments against member institutions	2, 325, 000	2, 325, 000	2, 325, 000	2, 325, 000		
Total, Farm Credit Administration	2, 909, 700	2, 904, 700	2, 905, 000	2, 625, 000	−279, 700	−280, 000
EXTENSION SERVICE						
Payments to States, etc	27, 103, 498	27, 103, 498	27, 164, 588	27, 135, 000	31, 502	−29, 588
Salaries and expenses	897, 500	888, 500	887, 500	880, 000	−8, 500	−7, 500
Total, Extension Service	28, 000, 998	27, 991, 998	28, 052, 088	28, 015, 000	23, 002	−37, 088

[9] Includes carry-over of $341,286 from fiscal year 1950.
[10] Includes accumulated reserve of $25,750,000 available from prior-year operations.
[11] Formerly designated as "Acreage allotments and marketing quotas."
[12] Includes $4,095,500 allocated from "Expenses of defense production, 1951."

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951, amounts as reduced under sec. 1214 (general reduction of $550,000,000 in General Appropriation Act, 1951), estimates for 1952, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1952—Continued

TITLE I—REGULAR ACTIVITIES—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951		Estimates, 1952	Recommended in bill for 1952	Bill compared with—	
	Specific amounts	As reduced under sec. 1214			1951, as reduced under sec. 1214	1952 estimates
Office of the Secretary	[13] $2, 181, 800	[13] $2, 157, 200	$2, 191, 250	$2, 157, 200	----------	−$34, 050
Office of Solicitor	[14] 2, 590, 500	[14] 2, 552, 100	2, 463, 000	2, 200, 000	−$352, 100	−263, 000
Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations	[15] 645, 000	[16] 645, 000	600, 000	600, 000	−45, 000	----------
Office of Information	[16] 1, 288, 900	[16] 1, 274, 600	1, 271, 000	1, 271, 000	−3, 600	----------
Library	713, 293	702, 593	700, 000	700, 000	−2, 593	----------
Total, title I	812, 367, 200	772, 500, 700	786, 605, 546	719, 707, 433	−52, 793, 267	−66, 898, 113

[13] Includes $13,000 allocated from "Expenses of defense production, 1951."
[14] Includes $28,000 allocated from "Expenses of defense production, 1951."
[15] Includes $45,000 allocated from "Expenses of defense production, 1951."
[16] Includes $4,100 allocated from "Expenses of defense production, 1951."

TITLE II—SPECIAL ACTIVITIES

Research on strategic and critical materials	$399, 000	$399, 000	$700, 000	$450, 000	$51, 000	−$250,000
Eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals	----------	----------	32, 700, 000	(17)	----------	−32,700,000
International Wheat Agreement	----------	----------	(76, 808, 000)	(18)	----------	(−76,808,000)
Total, title II	399, 000	399, 000	33, 400, 000	450, 000	51, 000	−32,950,000
Total, direct annual appropriations	812, 766, 200	772, 899, 700	820, 005, 546	720, 157, 433	−52, 742, 267	−99,848,113

[17] Changed in bill from direct appropriation to note cancellation.
[18] Changed in bill from transfer from Section 32 permanent appropriation to note cancellation.

O

Union Calendar No. 111

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

[Report No. 421]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 4, 1951

Mr. WHITTEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

A BILL

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, namely:

1 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

2 TITLE I—REGULAR ACTIVITIES

3 RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946

4 To enable the Secretary to improve and develop, in-
5 dependently or through cooperation among Federal and
6 State agencies, and others, a sound and efficient system for
7 the distribution and marketing of agricultural products under
8 the provisions of titles II and III of the Act of August
9 14, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1621–1629), $4,700,000:
10 *Provided,* That not less than $600,000 of this amount shall
11 be available for contracts in accordance with the provisions
12 of section 205 of said Act: *Provided further,* That
13 the Secretary may make available to any bureau,
14 office, or agency of the Department such amounts
15 from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry
16 out the functions for which it is made (but amounts
17 made available to the Office of the Secretary, Office of the
18 Solicitor, and Office of Information, shall not exceed those
19 which the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon
20 with representatives of the Department, shall determine),
21 and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts trans-
22 ferred or otherwise made available to other appropriation
23 items of the Department: *Provided further,* That no part
24 of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to
25 fish or shellfish or any product thereof, except for the sup-

1 port of equitable transportation rates before Federal agen-
2 cies concerned with such rates and for development of foreign
3 markets.

4 BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

5 For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of
6 the Act establishing the Bureau of Agricultural Economics
7 (7 U. S. C. 411) and related Acts, as follows:

8 Economic investigations: For conducting investigations
9 and for acquiring and diffusing useful information among the
10 people of the United States, relative to agricultural pro-
11 duction, distribution, land utilization, and conservation in
12 their broadest aspects, including farm management and prac-
13 tice, utilization of farm and food products, purchasing of farm
14 supplies, farm population and rural life, farm labor, farm
15 finance, insurance and taxation, adjustments in production
16 to probable demand for the different farm and food products;
17 land ownership and values, costs, prices and income in their
18 relation to agriculture, including causes for their variations
19 and trends, $2,150,000: *Provided,* That no part of the
20 funds herein appropriated or made available to the Bureau
21 of Agricultural Economics under the heading "Economic
22 investigations" shall be used for State and county land-use
23 planning, for conducting cultural surveys, or for the main-
24 tenance of regional offices.

25 Crop and livestock estimates: For collecting, compiling,

1 abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and pub-
2 lishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and live-
3 stock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, staples of cotton,
4 stocks, and value of farm crops and numbers, grades, and
5 value of livestock and livestock products on farms, pro-
6 duction, distribution, and consumption of turpentine and
7 rosin pursuant to the Act of August 15, 1935 (5 U. S. C.
8 556b), and for the collection and publication of statistics
9 of peanuts as provided by the Act approved June 24, 1936,
10 as amended May 12, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 951–957),
11 $2,850,000: *Provided,* That no part of the funds herein
12 appropriated shall be available for any expense incident
13 to ascertaining, collating, or publishing a report stating the
14 intention of farmers as to the acreage to be planted in cotton,
15 or for estimates of apple production for other than the
16 commercial crop.

17 AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

18 OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

19 For necessary expenses of the Office of Administrator,
20 including travel and subsistence expenses of advisory com-
21 mittees authorized by title III of the Act of August 14, 1946
22 (7 U. S. C. 1628–1629), and the maintenance, operation,
23 and furnishing of facilities and services at the Agricultural
24 Research Center, $560,000: *Provided,* That the appro-
25 priation current at the time services are rendered may

1 be reimbursed (by advance credits or reimbursements
2 based on estimated or actual charges) from applicable appro-
3 priations, to cover the charges, including handling and other
4 related services, for equipment rentals (including depre-
5 ciation, maintenance, and repairs); for services, supplies,
6 equipment, and material furnished: *Provided further,* That
7 of the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research
8 Administration, not to exceed $15,000 shall be available
9 for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section
10 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as
11 amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
12 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further,* That the several appro-
13 priations of the Agricultural Research Administration shall
14 be available for the construction, alteration, and repair of
15 buildings and improvements: *Provided, however,* That unless
16 otherwise provided, the cost of constructing any one build-
17 ing (excepting headhouses connecting greenhouses and
18 experimental farm houses) shall not exceed $5,000, the
19 total amount for construction of buildings costing more
20 than $2,500 each shall be within the limits of the esti-
21 mates submitted and approved therefor, and the cost of
22 altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not
23 exceed $2,500 or 2 per centum of the cost of the building
24 as certified by the Research Administrator, whichever is
25 greater: *Provided further,* That not to exceed 7 per centum

1 of the funds of any research appropriation of the Agricul-
2 tural Research Administration, including the appropriation
3 for the Office of the Administrator, may be transferred by
4 the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary, to
5 any other such research appropriation in order to provide
6 for a more effective research program: *Provided, however,*
7 That no appropriation may be increased more than 7 per
8 centum by such transfers.

9 RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA

10 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to con-
11 duct research into the basic agricultural needs and problems
12 of the Territory of Alaska, through such agencies of the De-
13 partment as he may designate, independently or in coopera-
14 tion with appropriate agencies of the Territory of Alaska,
15 $250,000.

16 OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

17 Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico

18 For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto
19 Rico to be paid quarterly in advance where applicable, to
20 carry into effect the provisions of the following Acts relating
21 to agricultural experiment stations:

22 Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related
23 Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7
24 U. S. C. 362, 363, 365, 368, 377–379), $720,000; Adams

1 Act, the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369),
2 $720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24,
3 1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373–376, 380, 382),
4 $2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act ap-
5 proved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), sections 3
6 and 5, $2,863,708, and sections 9 and 11 of said Act as
7 added by the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427h,
8 427j), including administration by the Office of Experi-
9 ment Stations in the United States Department of Agri-
10 culture, $5,000,000, no part of which latter amount shall
11 be used for beginning construction of any building costing
12 in excess of $15,000, except that a poultry breeding house
13 may be constructed at Purdue University at a cost to this
14 appropriation of not to exceed $29,000; Hawaii, the Act
15 approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386–386b), extending
16 the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to the Territory of
17 Hawaii, $90,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23,
18 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Hatch
19 Act to the Territory of Alaska, $15,000, and the provisions
20 of section 2 of the Act approved June 20, 1936, as amended
21 (7 U. S. C. 369a, Public Law 739, approved August 29,
22 1950), extending the benefits of the Adams and Purnell
23 Acts to the Territory of Alaska, $37,500; Puerto Rico, the
24 Act approved March 4, 1931, as amended (7 U. S. C.

1 386d–386f), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Con-
2 gress to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments to States,
3 Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, $12,416,208.

4 Salaries and Expenses

5 For necessary expenses in connection with administra-
6 tion of grants and coordination of research with States pur-
7 suant to the Acts approved March 2, 1887, March 16, 1906,
8 February 24, 1925, May 16, 1928, February 23, 1929,
9 March 4, 1931, and June 20, 1936, and Acts amendatory
10 thereto (7 U. S. C. 361–363, 365–383, 386–386f), and
11 title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended by
12 the Act of September 21, 1944 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g),
13 and for the administration, operation, and maintenance of
14 an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, $390,000;
15 and the Secretary shall prescribe the form of the annual
16 financial statement required under the above Acts, ascertain
17 whether the expenditures are in accordance with their pro-
18 visions, coordinate the research work of the State agricul-
19 tural colleges and experiment stations in the lines authorized
20 in said Acts with research of the Department in similar
21 lines, and make report thereon to Congress.

22 BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

23 For necessary expenses in connection with conducting
24 investigations of the relative utility and economy of agri-
25 cultural products for food, clothing, and other uses in the

1 home, with special suggestions of plans and methods for
2 the more effective utilization of such products for these
3 purposes, and such economic investigations, including
4 housing and household buying, as have for their purpose
5 the improvement of the rural home, for coordinating nutri-
6 tion services made available by Federal, State, and other
7 agencies, and for disseminating useful information on these
8 subjects, $1,350,000.

9 BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

10 Salaries and Expenses

11 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
12 the Act, as amended, establishing a Bureau of Animal
13 Industry, and related Acts, and for investigation concerned
14 with the livestock and meat industries and the domestic
15 raising of fur-bearing animals, as follows:

16 Animal research: For animal husbandry investigations;
17 investigations of diseases of animals and of tuberculin,
18 serums, antitoxins, and analogous products; and cooperation
19 in the administration of regulations for the improvement of
20 poultry, poultry products, and hatcheries, as authorized by
21 law (7 U. S. C. 429, Public Law 662, approved August 4,
22 1950); $3,200,700.

23 Animal disease control and eradication: For the control
24 and eradication of tuberculosis and paratuberculosis of ani-

1 mals, avian turberculosis, Bang's disease of cattle, scabies
2 in sheep and cattle, southern cattle ticks, hog cholera and
3 related swine diseases, and dourine in horses, and other
4 inspection and quarantine work authorized by law; for
5 supervision of the transportation of livestock, including
6 administration of the twenty-eight-hour law; for inspection
7 of vessels; and for carrying out the provisions of the Act
8 of March 4, 1913 (21 U. S. C. 151–158), relating to
9 veterinary biological products, $7,750,000, including $30,000
10 for the acquisition of land and construction of buildings for
11 inspection of livestock at Canadian border ports of entry:
12 *Provided,* That no payment hereunder as compensation
13 for any cattle condemned for slaughter for tuberculosis,
14 paratuberculosis, or Bang's disease shall exceed (1) $25
15 for any grade animal or $50 for any pure bred animal,
16 (2) one-third of the difference between the appraised value
17 and the value of salvage thereof, or (3) the amount paid
18 or to be paid by the State or other cooperating agency,
19 and no payment hereunder shall be made for any animal
20 if at the time of test or condemnation it shall belong
21 to or be upon the premises of any person, firm, or corpora-
22 tion to which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered for
23 slaughter.

24 Marketing agreements, hog cholera virus and serum:
25 For carrying into effect sections 56 to 60, inclusive, of the

1 Act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 851–855)
2 regulating the marketing of anti-hog-cholera serum and hog-
3 cholera virus, $49,300.

4 Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of
5 laws relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat-food
6 products, including the purchase of one passenger motor
7 vehicle for replacement only, $12,800,000: *Provided*, That
8 hereafter reimbursement may be made by any person, firm,
9 or organization for the expenses of meat inspection in excess
10 of those which can be met from the amount appropriated
11 for such purposes each year.

12 BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

13 For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions
14 of the Act of May 29, 1924 (7 U. S. C. 401–404), includ-
15 ing investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in dairy
16 industry, the applicable provisions of the Act of May 9,
17 1902 (26 U. S. C. 2325, 2326 (c)), relating to process
18 or renovated butter, as amended, and the Act of May 23,
19 1908 (21 U. S. C. 94 (a)), insofar as it relates to the
20 exportation of process or renovated butter, $1,450,000.

21 BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

22 For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments,
23 and demonstrations established under the provisions of sec-
24 tion 202 (a) to 202 (e), inclusive, of title II of the Agri-
25 cultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1292); for the

1 development of new and extended food, feed, and industrial
2 uses for agricultural commodities, both plant and animal,
3 and potential replacement crops, and processing, biological,
4 chemical, physical, pharmacological, toxicological, and tech-
5 nological investigation thereof, $7,200,000.

6 BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL
7 ENGINEERING

8 Plant, soil, and agricultural engineering research: For
9 expenses necessary for investigations, experiments, and dem-
10 onstrations concerning plants, soils, and agricultural engi-
11 neering, including those related to the production, improve-
12 ment, handling, processing, transportation, and storage of
13 farm and other crops; control of weeds, plant diseases, and
14 nematodes; discovery and introduction of new and useful
15 plants, both foreign and native; soil and water management
16 to improve soil productivity; the relation of soils to plant,
17 animal, and human nutrition; classification and mapping of
18 soils; fertilizers, liming materials, and soil amendments;
19 farm machinery and processing equipment; farm buildings,
20 and farm electrification; and for the operation and mainte-
21 nance of airplanes; $10,351,400.

22 National Arboretum: For the maintenance and develop-
23 ment of the National Arboretum established under the pro-

1 visions of the Act approved March 4, 1927 (20 U. S. C.
2 191–194), $148,600.

3 BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

4 Salaries and Expenses

5 For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments,
6 demonstrations, and surveys for the promotion of economic
7 entomology, for investigating and ascertaining the best
8 means of destroying insects and related pests injurious to
9 agriculture, for importing useful and beneficial insects and
10 bacterial, fungal, and other diseases of insects and related
11 pests, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of
12 destroying insects affecting man and animals, and the best
13 ways of utilizing beneficial insects, for carrying into effect
14 the provisions of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20,
15 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), the Honey Bee
16 Act (7 U. S. C. 281–283), the Insect Pest Act (7 U. S. C.
17 141–144), the Mexican Border Act (7 U. S. C. 149), and
18 the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), as amended,
19 authorizing the eradication, control, and prevention of spread
20 of injurious insects and plant pests; including the operation
21 and maintenance of airplanes and the purchase of not to
22 exceed two, as follows:

23 Insect investigations: For the investigation of insects
24 affecting fruits, grapes, nuts, trees, shrubs, forests and forest

1 products, truck and garden crops, cereal, forage and range
2 crops, cotton, tobacco, sugar plants, ornamental and other
3 plants and agricultural products, household possessions, and
4 man and animals; for bee culture and apiary management;
5 for classifying, identifying, and collecting information to de-
6 termine the distribution and abundance of insects; for inves-
7 tigations in connection with introduction of natural enemies
8 of injurious insects and related pests and for the exchange
9 with other countries of useful and beneficial insects and other
10 arthropods; for developing methods, equipment, and appa-
11 ratus to aid in enforcing plant quarantines and in the eradica-
12 tion and control of insect pests and plant diseases; and for
13 investigations of insecticides and fungicides, including meth-
14 ods of their manufacture and use and the effects of their
15 application, $3,525,000: *Provided,* That of the amount
16 allotted for oriental fruitfly, not to exceed $250,000 may
17 be used for contracts with public or private agencies for
18 research in accordance with section 10 (a) of the Act of
19 August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427i), and the amounts
20 obligated for contract research shall remain available until
21 expended.

22 Insect and plant-disease control: For carrying out
23 operations or measures to eradicate, suppress, control, or to
24 prevent or retard the spread of Japanese beetle, sweetpotato
25 weevil, Mexican fruitflies, phony peach and peach mosaic,

1 cereal rusts, pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil, golden
2 nematode, citrus blackfly, white-fringed beetle, Hall scale,
3 and gypsy and brown-tail moths, including the enforce-
4 ment of quarantine regulations and cooperation with States
5 to enforce plant quarantines as authorized by the Plant
6 Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7
7 U. S. C. 151–167), and including the establishment of
8 such cotton-free areas as may be necessary to stamp out
9 any infestation of the pink bollworm as authorized by the
10 Act of February 8, 1930 (46 Stat. 67), and for cooperation
11 with States in the compensation of growers for losses result-
12 ing from the destruction of or for not planting potatoes and
13 tomatoes on lands infested or exposed to infestations of the
14 golden nematode for the purpose authorized by the Golden
15 Nematode Act (Public Law 645, approved June 15, 1948),
16 $4,500,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropria-
17 tion shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees, farm
18 animals, farm crops, or other property injured or destroyed,
19 except potatoes and tomatoes as authorized under the
20 Golden Nematode Act: *Provided further,* That, in
21 the discretion of the Secretary, no part of this appro-
22 priation shall be expended for the control of sweet-
23 potato weevil in any State until such State has provided
24 cooperation necessary to accomplish this purpose, or for
25 barberry eradication until a sum or sums at least equal to

1 such expenditures shall have been appropriated, subscribed,
2 or contributed by States, counties, or local authorities, or
3 by individuals or organizations for the accomplishment of
4 this purpose, or with respect to the golden nematode except
5 as prescribed in section 4 of the Golden Nematode Act.

6 Plant quarantines: For operations against the in-
7 troduction of insect pests or plant diseases into the
8 United States, including the enforcement of foreign-
9 plant quarantines and regulations promulgated under sections
10 5 and 7 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912,
11 as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), the Insect Pest Act of
12 1905 (7 U. S. C. 141–144), and the Mexican Border Act
13 of 1942 (7 U. S. C. 149), for enforcement of domestic-
14 plant quarantines as they pertain to Territories and districts
15 of the United States, for the enforcement of plant quarantines
16 through inspection in transit, including the interception and
17 disposition of materials found to have been transported in
18 violation of Federal plant quarantine laws or regulations, and
19 operations under the Terminal Inspection Act (7 U. S. C.
20 166) and enforcement of regulations governing the move-
21 ment of plants into and from the District of Columbia
22 promulgated under section 15 of the Plant Quarantine Act
23 of August 20, 1912, as amended, and for inspection and
24 certification of plants and plant products to meet the sani-
25 tary requirements of foreign countries, as authorized in sec-

1 tion 102 of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a),
2 $2,600,000.

3 Control of Emergency Outbreaks of Insects and Plant
4 Diseases

5 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
6 the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C.
7 148–148e), including the operation and maintenance of air-
8 planes and the purchase of not to exceed two, and surveys
9 and control operations in Canada in cooperation with the
10 Canadian Government or local Canadian authorities, and
11 the employment of Canadian citizens, $1,800,000, of which
12 $1,000,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section
13 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, for the purposes
14 of said joint resolution only to the extent that the Secretary,
15 with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds neces-
16 sary to meet emergency conditions.

17 Control of Forest Pests

18 For expenses necessary for carrying out operations,
19 measures, or surveys necessary to eradicate, suppress, con-
20 trol, or to prevent or retard the spread of insects or diseases
21 which endanger forest trees on any lands in the United
22 States, and for such quarantine measures relating thereto
23 as may be necessary pursuant to the Plant Quarantine Act
24 of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167),

1 including the purchase (not to exceed two) and operation
2 and maintenance of airplanes, and construction and alteration
3 of necessary buildings: *Provided,* That the cost of construct-
4 ing or altering any one building during the fiscal year shall
5 not exceed $2,500, as follows:

6 Forest Pest Control Act: For carrying out the provi-
7 sions of the Act approved June 25, 1947 (16 U. S. C.,
8 Supp. I, 594-1—594-5), $1,700,000, of which $500,000
9 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the
10 Revised Statutes, as amended, for the purposes of said Act
11 only to the extent that the Secretary, with the approval of
12 the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency
13 conditions.

14 White pine blister rust: White pine blister rust, pur-
15 suant to the Act of April 26, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 594a),
16 $3,300,000, of which $505,000 shall be available to the
17 Department of the Interior for the control of white pine
18 blister rust on or endangering Federal lands under the
19 jurisdiction of that Department or lands of Indian tribes
20 which are under the jurisdiction of or retained under re-
21 strictions of the United States; $1,750,000 to the Forest
22 Service for the control of white pine blister rust on or endan-
23 gering lands under its jurisdiction; and $1,045,000 to the
24 Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine for leadership
25 and general coordination of the entire program, method de-

1 velopment, and for operations conducted under its direction
2 for such control, including, but not confined to, the control of
3 white pine blister rust on or endangering State and privately
4 owned lands.

5 FOREST SERVICE

6 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

7 For expenses necessary, including not to exceed $10,000
8 for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section
9 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as
10 amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
11 (5 U. S. C. 55a); to experiment and make investigations
12 and report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and lum-
13 bering, but no part of this appropriation shall be used for
14 any experiment or test made outside the jurisdiction of the
15 United States; to advise the owners of woodlands as to
16 the proper care of the same; to investigate and test Amer-
17 ican timber and timber trees and their uses, and methods
18 for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek, through
19 investigations and the planting of native and foreign spe-
20 cies, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to erect neces-
21 sary buildings: *Provided,* That the cost of any building pur-
22 chased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost (not
23 to exceed $1,000) of constructing a water-supply or sani-
24 tary system and of connecting the same with any such
25 building, and exclusive of the cost of any tower upon which

1 a lookout house may be erected, shall not exceed $15,000,
2 with the exception that any building erected, purchased,
3 or acquired, the cost of which was $15,000 or more, may
4 be improved out of the appropriations made under this
5 Act for the Forest Service by an amount not to exceed 2
6 per centum of the cost of such building as certified by the
7 Chief of the Forest Service; to protect, administer, and
8 improve the national forests, including tree planting
9 and other measures to prevent erosion, drift, surface
10 wash, soil waste, and the formation of floods, and to con-
11 serve water; to ascertain the natural conditions upon and
12 utilize the national forests, to transport and care for fish
13 and game supplied to stock the national forests or the waters
14 therein; to collate, digest, report, and illustrate the results
15 of experiments and investigations made by the Forest Serv-
16 ice, as follows:
17 National forest protection and management: For the
18 administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement,
19 and development of the national forests, including the estab-
20 lishment and maintenance of forest tree nurseries, includ-
21 ing the procurement of tree seed and nursery stock by
22 purchase, production, or otherwise, seeding and tree plant-
23 ing and the care of plantations and young growth; the
24 operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of
25 not to exceed three; the maintenance of roads and trails

1 and the construction and maintenance of all other improve-
2 ments necessary for the proper and economical adminis-
3 tration, protection, development, and use of the national
4 forests, including experimental areas under Forest Service
5 administration, except that where direct purchases will be
6 more economical than construction, improvements may be
7 purchased; the construction (not to exceed $15,000 for
8 any one structure), equipment, and maintenance of sani-
9 tary and recreational facilities; timber cultural operations;
10 development and application of fish and game management
11 plans; propagation and transplanting of plants suitable for
12 planting on semiarid portions of the national forests; esti-
13 mating and appraising of timber and other resources and
14 development and application of plans for their effective
15 management, sale, and use; expenses of the National Forest
16 Reservation Commission as authorized by section 14 of the
17 Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 514); examination,
18 classification, surveying, and appraisal of land incident to
19 effecting exchanges authorized by law and of lands within
20 the boundaries of the national forests that may be opened
21 to homestead settlement and entry under the Act of June 11,
22 1906, and the Act of August 10, 1912 (16 U. S. C. 506–
23 509), as provided by the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C.
24 512); investigation and establishment of water rights, in-
25 cluding the purchase thereof or of lands or interests in lands

1 or rights-of-way for use and protection of water rights neces-
2 sary or beneficial in connection with the administration and
3 public use of the national forests; and all expenses necessary
4 for the use, maintenance, improvement, protection, and gen-
5 eral administration of the national forests, $27,122,025, of
6 which not to exceed $75,000 shall be available for the
7 purchase of three nursery sites.

8 Fighting forest fires: For fighting and preventing forest
9 fires on or threatening lands under Forest Service adminis-
10 tration, including lands under contract for purchase or in
11 process of condemnation for Forest Service purposes, and
12 for liquidation of obligations incurred in the preceding fiscal
13 year for such purpose, $6,000,000, of which $2,500,000
14 shall be apportioned for use, pursuant to section 3679 of the
15 Revised Statutes, as amended, only to the extent that the
16 Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget,
17 finds necessary to meet emergency conditions.

18 Forest research: For forest research at forest or range
19 experiment stations, the Forest Products Laboratory, or else-
20 where, in accordance with the provisions of sections 1, 2,
21 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the Act approved May 22, 1928, as
22 amended (16 U. S. C. 581, 581a, 581f–581i), including
23 the construction and maintenance of improvements; fire,
24 silvicultural, watershed, and other forest investigations and
25 experiments; investigations and experiments to develop im-

1 proved methods of management of forest and other ranges;
2 experiments, investigations, and tests of forest products; a
3 comprehensive forest survey; and investigations in forest
4 economics; $5,220,500: *Provided,* That hereafter funds may
5 be received from any State, other political subdivision, organ-
6 ization, or individual for the purpose of establishing or
7 operating any forest research facility located within the
8 United States, its Territories, or possessions.

9 FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

10 For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions
11 of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act approved No-
12 vember 9, 1921, as amended (23 U. S. C. 23, 23a), re-
13 lating to forest development roads and trails, including the
14 construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of roads and
15 trails on experimental areas under Forest Service ad-
16 ministration, $11,500,000, which sum is authorized to
17 be appropriated by the Acts of June 29, 1948 (Public
18 Law 834), and September 7, 1950 (Public Law 769),
19 to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That
20 this appropriation shall be available for the rental, purchase,
21 construction, or alteration of buildings necessary for the
22 storage and repair of equipment and supplies used for road
23 and trail construction and maintenance, but the total cost
24 of any such building purchased, altered, or constructed under
25 this authorization shall not exceed $15,000 with the excep-

1 tion that any building erected, purchased, or acquired, the
2 cost of which was $15,000 or more, may be improved
3 within any fiscal year by an amount not to exceed 2 per
4 centum of the cost of such buildings certified by the Chief of
5 the Forest Service.

6 ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

7 Weeks Act

8 For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions
9 of the Act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16
10 U. S. C. 513–519, 521), $100,000, to be available
11 only for payment toward the purchase price of any
12 lands acquired, including the cost of surveys in con-
13 nection with such acquisition: *Provided,* That no part of
14 such funds shall be used for the purchase of lands in the
15 counties of Adair, Cherokee, and Sequoyah, in the State
16 of Oklahoma, without the specific approval of the Board
17 of County Commissioners of the county in which such lands
18 are situated.

19 Superior National Forest

20 For the acquisition of forest land within the Superior
21 National Forest, Minnesota, under the provisions of the
22 Act approved June 22, 1948 (Public Law 733), $100,000,
23 to remain available until expended.

24 Special Acts

25 For the acquisition of land to facilitate the control of

1 soil erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior
2 boundaries of the following national forests, in accordance
3 with the provisions of the following Acts authorizing annual
4 appropriations of forest receipts for such purposes, and in
5 not to exceed the following amounts from such receipts:
6 Uinta and Wasatch National Forests, Utah, Act of August
7 26, 1935 (Public Law 337), as amended, $40,000; Cache
8 National Forest, Utah, Act of May 11, 1938 (Public
9 Law 505), as amended, $10,000; San Bernardino and
10 Cleveland National Forests, Riverside County, California,
11 Act of June 15, 1938 (Public Law 634), as amended,
12 $22,000; Nevada and Toiyabe National Forests, Nevada,
13 Act of June 25, 1938 (Public Law 748), as amended,
14 $10,000; Angeles National Forest, California, Act of June
15 11, 1940 (Public Law 591), $20,000; Cleveland National
16 Forest, San Diego County, California, Act of June 11, 1940
17 (Public Law 589), $5,000; Sequoia National Forest,
18 California, Act of June 17, 1940 (Public Law 637),
19 $35,000; in all $142,000.

20 STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

21 For expenses necessary for cooperation with the various
22 States in forest-fire prevention and suppression, in forest
23 tree planting, in forest management and processing, and in
24 farm forestry extension, pursuant to the Act of August 25,

1 1950 (Public Law 729), and sections 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of
2 the Act of June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 564–568a), and
3 Acts supplementary thereto; advising timberland owners,
4 associations, and other appropriate agencies in the applica-
5 tion of forest management principles to federally owned
6 lands leased to States and to private forest lands, and ad-
7 vising wood-using industries in processing of forest products,
8 so as to attain sustained-yield management, the conservation
9 of the timber resources, the productivity of forest lands, and
10 the stabilization of employment and economic continuance
11 of forest industries; $10,750,000.

12 COOPERATIVE RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

13 For artificial revegetation, construction, and mainte-
14 nance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradi-
15 cation of poisonous and noxious plants on national forests,
16 as authorized by section 12 of the Act of April 24, 1950
17 (Public Law 478), $700,000, to remain available until
18 expended: *Provided,* That hereafter no part of the appro-
19 priation for "Cooperative Range Improvements" shall
20 be expended in any national forest until funds or other
21 contributions at least equal to such expenditures are
22 made available by States or other local public or private
23 sources, except that claims recognized by the Act of Decem-
24 ber 29, 1950, shall be accepted as contributions for the
25 purposes of this section.

1 FLOOD CONTROL

2 For expenses necessary, in accordance with the Flood
3 Control Act, approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law 738),
4 as amended and supplemented, to make preliminary exami-
5 nations and surveys, and to perform works of improvement,
6 and to plan the agricultural phases of the development of the
7 Columbia Basin area, the Arkansas-White-Red River area,
8 and the New England-New York area, in accordance with
9 the provisions of laws relating to the activities of the
10 Department, including not to exceed $100,000 for em-
11 ployment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a)
12 of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by
13 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a),
14 to remain available until expended, $8,000,000, with
15 which shall be merged the unexpended balances of funds
16 heretofore appropriated or transferred to the Department for
17 flood-control purposes: *Provided,* That no part of such funds
18 shall be used for the purchase of lands in the Yazoo and
19 Little Tallahatchie watersheds without specific approval of
20 the county board of supervisors of the county in which such
21 lands are situated, nor shall any part of such funds be used
22 for the purchase of lands in the counties of Adair, Cherokee,
23 and Sequoyah, in the State of Oklahoma, without the specific

1 approval of the Board of County Commissioners of the
2 county in which such lands are situated: *Provided fur-*
3 *ther,* That of the funds available herein, not in excess of
4 $6,000,000 (with which shall be merged the unexpended
5 balance of funds heretofore made available for these pur-
6 poses) may be expended in watersheds heretofore author-
7 ized by section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December
8 22, 1944, for necessary gully control, floodwater detention,
9 and floodway structures in areas other than those over
10 which the Department of the Army has jurisdiction and
11 responsibility.

12 SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

13 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

14 For necessary expenses for carrying out the provisions
15 of the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f),
16 title III of the Act of July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010–
17 1012), and the Act of August 11, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 1011
18 note), including research and investigations into the charac-
19 ter, cause, extent, history, and effects of erosion, soil and
20 moisture depletion, and methods of soil and water conserva-
21 tion (including the construction and hydrologic phases of
22 farm irrigation and land drainage, and the construction,
23 operation, and maintenance of experimental watersheds,
24 stations, laboratories, plots, and installations and water regu-
25 lation to conserve the soil and reduce fire hazards in the

1 Everglades region of Florida, except that expenditures for
2 all work in the Everglades region shall be limited to a sum
3 not in excess of funds made available for such work by the
4 State of Florida, or political subdivisions thereof) ; making
5 conservation surveys and plans and establishing measures to
6 conserve soil and water (including farm irrigation and land
7 drainage and such special measures as may be necessary
8 to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs) ; establish-
9 ment and operation of conservation nurseries; development
10 and management of land utilization project lands and facili-
11 ties; dissemination of information; purchase and erection
12 or alteration of permanent buildings; operation and mainte-
13 nance of aircraft; and furnishing of subsistence to employees;
14 $54,278,000: *Provided,* That the cost of any permanent
15 building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of
16 the cost of constructing a water supply or sanitary system
17 and connecting the same to any such building and with the
18 exception of buildings acquired in conjunction with land
19 being purchased for other purposes, shall not exceed $2,500,
20 except for eight buildings to be constructed or improved at a
21 cost not to exceed $15,000 per building and except that
22 alterations or improvements to other existing permanent
23 buildings costing $2,500 or more may be made in any fiscal
24 year in an amount not to exceed $500 per building: *Provided*

1 *further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be available
2 for the construction of any such building on land not owned
3 by the Government: *Provided further,* That in the State of
4 Missouri, where the State has established a central State
5 agency authorized to enter into agreements with the United
6 States or any of its agencies on policies and general pro-
7 grams for the saving of its soil by the extension of Federal
8 aid to any soil conservation district in such State, the agree-
9 ments made by or on behalf of the United States with any
10 such soil conservation district shall have the prior approval
11 of such central State agency before they shall become effective
12 as to such district: *Provided further,* That no part of this
13 appropriation may be expended for soil and water conserva-
14 tion operations under the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C.
15 590a–590f), in demonstration projects: *Provided further,*
16 That not to exceed $5,000 may be used for employment pur-
17 suant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic
18 Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15
19 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided*
20 *further,* That not to exceed $265,000 of funds authorized
21 for fiscal year 1951 for development of land utilization proj-
22 ects may remain available until expended.

23 WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

24 For expenses necessary to carry into effect the functions
25 of the Department under the Acts of May 10, 1939 (53 Stat.

1 685, 719), October 14, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 590y–z–10), as
2 amended and supplemented, June 28, 1949 (Public Law
3 132), and September 6, 1950 (Public Law 760), relating
4 to water conservation and utilization projects, to remain
5 available until expended, $185,500, which sum shall be
6 merged with the unexpended balances of funds heretofore
7 appropriated or transferred to said Department for the
8 purposes of said Act.

9 PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

10 CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND

11 RESOURCES

12 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the pro-
13 visions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation
14 and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936,
15 as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q), including not to
16 exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits,
17 including such displays at State, interstate, and international
18 fairs within the United States; $256,500,000, to remain
19 available until December 31 of the next succeeding fiscal
20 year for compliance with the program of soil-building prac-
21 tices and soil- and water-conserving practices authorized
22 under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appro-
23 priation Act, 1951, carried out during the period July 1,
24 1950, to December 31, 1951, inclusive: *Provided,* That not
25 to exceed $25,250,000 of the total sum provided under

1 this head shall be available during the current fiscal year
2 for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying
3 out such program, the cost of aerial photographs, however,
4 not to be charged to such limitation; but not more than
5 $4,966,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account,
6 "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjust-
7 ment Act of 1938": *Provided further,* That payments to
8 claimants hereunder may be made upon the certificate of
9 the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the
10 Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the con-
11 servation practice or practices and has complied with all
12 other requirements as conditions for such payments and that
13 the statements and information contained in the application
14 for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge
15 and belief, under the penalties of title 18, United States Code:
16 *Provided further,* That none of the funds herein appropriated
17 or made available for the functions assigned to the Agri-
18 cultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order
19 Numbered 9069, of February 23, 1942, shall be used to
20 pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information
21 employees or any State information employees, but this shall
22 not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of in-
23 formation at the county level to individual farmers: *Provided*
24 *further,* That such amount shall be available for salaries and
25 other administrative expenses in connection with the formu-

1 lation and administration of the 1952 program of soil-
2 building practices and soil- and water-conserving practices,
3 under the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended (amount-
4 ing to $225,000,000, including administration, and formu-
5 lated on the basis of a distribution of the funds available for
6 payments and grants among the several States in accordance
7 with their conservation needs as determined by the Secre-
8 tary, except that the proportion allocated to any State shall
9 not be reduced more than 15 per centum from the
10 distribution for the next preceding program year, and no
11 participant shall receive more than $2,500) ; but the pay-
12 ments or grants under such programs shall be conditioned
13 upon the utilization of land with respect to which such pay-
14 ments or grants are to be made in conformity with farming
15 practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building
16 and soil- and water-conserving practices in the most practical
17 and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several
18 States, as determined and approved by the State committees
19 appointed pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation
20 and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590h
21 (b)), for the respective States: *Provided further,* That not
22 to exceed 5 per centum of the allocation for the agricultural
23 conservation program for any county may be allotted with
24 the approval of the State committee to the Soil Conservation
25 Service for services of its technicians in formulating and

1 carrying out the agricultural conservation program and the
2 funds so allotted shall not be utilized by the Soil Conserva-
3 tion Service for any purpose other than technical and other
4 assistance in such county: *Provided further,* That such
5 amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, ferti-
6 lizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any
7 soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agri-
8 cultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming
9 practices approved by the Secretary under programs provided
10 for herein: *Provided further,* That no part of any funds
11 available to the Department, or any bureau, office, cor-
12 poration, or other agency constituting a part of such Depart-
13 ment, shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment
14 of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been
15 convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent
16 pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as
17 amended, or who has been found in accordance with the
18 provisions of title 18, United States Code, section 1913, to
19 have violated or attempted to violate such section which
20 prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the pay-
21 ment of personal services or other expenses designed to influ-
22 ence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose
23 any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon
24 request of any Member or through the proper official
25 channels.

1 AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION PROGRAMS

2 To enable the Secretary to formulate and carry out acre-
3 age allotment and marketing quota programs pursuant to
4 provisions of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act
5 of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1301–1393), and to pro-
6 vide assistance in obtaining equipment, materials, and facili-
7 ties necessary to attain needed production of agricultural
8 commodities, $8,300,000, of which not more than $2,000,-
9 000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account "Ad-
10 ministrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment
11 Act of 1938".

12 SUGAR ACT PROGRAM

13 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the pro-
14 visions of the Sugar Act of 1948 (7 U. S. C. 1101–1160),
15 $70,000,000, to remain available until June 30 of the next
16 succeeding fiscal year: *Provided,* That expenditures (includ-
17 ing transfers) from this appropriation for other than pay-
18 ments to sugar producers shall not exceed $1,500,000.

19 NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

20 To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of
21 the National School Lunch Act (42 U. S. C. 1751–1760),
22 $83,500,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation
23 shall be used for nonfood assistance under section 5 of said
24 Act.

1 MARKETING SERVICES

2 For expenses necessary for acquiring and diffusing
3 market information on agricultural commodities, food prod-
4 ucts and by-products, the standardization, classification,
5 grading, handling, storage and marketing thereof, including
6 the demonstration and promotion of the use of uniform stand-
7 ards of classification of American farm and food products
8 throughout the world, the analysis of cotton fiber, the classing
9 of cotton for producer members of cotton quality improve-
10 ment groups, the establishment of classification standards and
11 maintenance of an inspection service for tobacco (7. U. S. C.
12 471–476, 501–508, 511–511q) ; for investigating and certi-
13 fying, in one or more jurisdictions, to shippers and other
14 interested parties the class, quality, and condition of any
15 agricultural commodity or food product, whether raw or
16 processed, and any product containing an agricultural com-
17 modity or derivative thereof when offered for interstate ship-
18 ment or when received at such important central markets as
19 the Secretary may from time to time designate, or at points
20 which may be conveniently reached therefrom under such
21 rules and regulations as he may prescribe, including the
22 collection of such fees as are reasonable and as nearly as may
23 cover the cost of the service rendered; for performing the
24 duties imposed upon the Secretary by chapter 14 of the
25 Internal Revenue Code relating to cotton futures (26

1 U. S. C. 1920–1935); and for carrying into effect the
2 United States Cotton Standards Act (7 U. S. C. 51–65),
3 the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U. S. C. 71–87),
4 the Naval Stores Act (7 U. S. C. 91–99), section 201 (a)
5 to 201 (d), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjust-
6 ment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1291), including not to
7 exceed $25,000 for employment at rates not to exceed $100
8 per diem, pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a),
9 of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended
10 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a),
11 the Acts to provide standards for containers for fruits and
12 vegetables (15 U. S. C. 251–257i), the United States Ware-
13 house Act (7 U. S. C. 241–273), the Federal Seed Act
14 (7 U. S. C. 1551–1610), the Packers and Stockyards Act
15 (7 U. S. C. 181–229), the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide,
16 and Rodenticide Act (7 U. S. C. 135–135k), and the
17 Tobacco Plant and Seed Exportation Act (7 U. S. C. 516),
18 $10,800,000: *Provided,* That hereafter appropriations avail-
19 able for classing or grading any agricultural commodity with-
20 out charge to the producers thereof may be reimbursed from
21 nonadministrative funds of the Commodity Credit Corpora-
22 tion for the cost of classing or grading any such commodity
23 for producers who are eligible to obtain Commodity Credit
24 Corporation price support.

1 COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

2 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provi-
3 sions of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7
4 U. S. C. 1–17a), $650,000.

5 FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

6 For operating and administrative expenses, $8,000,000.

7 RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

8 To carry into effect the provisions of the Rural Elec-
9 trification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–924),
10 as follows:

11 LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS

12 For loans in accordance with said Act, and for carry-
13 ing out the provisions of section 7 thereof, to be borrowed
14 from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the
15 provisions of section 3 (a) of said Act as follows: Rural
16 electrification program, $100,000,000; and rural telephone
17 program, $9,000,000; and additional amounts, not to ex-
18 ceed a total of $100,000,000, may be borrowed for the rural
19 electrification program under the same terms and conditions
20 to the extent that such additional amounts are required dur-
21 ing the fiscal year 1952, under the then existing conditions,
22 for the expeditious and orderly development of the program.

23 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

24 For administrative expenses, including not to exceed
25 $500 for financial and credit reports, and not to exceed

1 $150,000 for employment pursuant to the second sentence
2 of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C.
3 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
4 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), $7,750,000.

5 FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

6 To carry into effect the provisions of titles I, II, and
7 the related provisions of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones
8 Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1000–1031),
9 the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946 (7 U. S. C.
10 1001, note; 31 U. S. C. 82h; 12 U. S. C. 371; 35 D. C.
11 Code 535; 60 Stat. 1062–1080); the Act of July 30, 1946
12 (40 U. S. C. 436–439); the Act of August 28, 1937, as
13 amended (16 U. S. C. 590r–590x, 590z–5), for the devel-
14 opment of facilities for water storage and utilization in the
15 arid and semiarid areas of the United States; the
16 provisions of title V of the Housing Act of 1949 relating
17 to financial assistance for farm housing (42 U. S. C. 1471–
18 1483); the Rural Rehabilitation Corporation Trust Liquida-
19 tion Act, approved May 3, 1950 (Public Law 499); and
20 the Act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey
21 certain mineral interests, approved September 6, 1950
22 (Public Law 760), as follows:

23 LOAN AUTHORIZATION

24 For loans (including payments in lieu of taxes and
25 taxes under section 50 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant

1 Act, as amended, and advances incident to the acquisition
2 and preservation of security of obligations under the fore-
3 going several authorities) : Title I and section 43 of title IV
4 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and
5 title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (except grants under
6 504 (a)) $38,000,000, of which not to exceed $5,000,000
7 of the amount available for the purposes of title I and sec-
8 tion 43 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as
9 amended, may be distributed to States and Territories with-
10 out regard to farm population and prevalence of tenancy,
11 in addition to the amount otherwise distributed thereto, for
12 loans in reclamation projects and to entrymen on unpatented
13 public land (sums available for loans under title V of the
14 Housing Act of 1949 to remain available until expended) ;
15 title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as
16 amended, $100,000,000; the Act of August 28, 1937, as
17 amended, $4,250,000: *Provided,* That not to exceed the
18 foregoing several amounts shall be borrowed in one account
19 from the Secretary of the Treasury, and, hereafter, such
20 sums annually for the purposes of this paragraph as the
21 Congress may determine by provision in appropriation
22 acts, on the request of the Secretary of Agriculture, at
23 such rate of interest as may be determined by the Secre-
24 tary of the Treasury, but not in excess of 3 per centum
25 per annum; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby

1 authorized and directed to lend such sums to the Secretary
2 upon the security of any obligations of borrowers from
3 the Secretary under the provisions of said Acts: *Provided*
4 *further,* That the Secretary may utilize proceeds from
5 payments of principal and interest under such Acts to
6 repay the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts borrowed
7 therefrom for the purposes of such Acts: *Provided further,*
8 That for the purpose of making loans pursuant to the fore-
9 going authority, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized
10 to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the
11 sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond
12 Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may
13 be issued under that Act are extended to include such loans
14 to the Secretary: *Provided further,* That repayments to the
15 Secretary of the Treasury on such loans shall be treated as a
16 public-debt transaction.

17 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

18 For the making, servicing, and collecting of loans and
19 insured mortgages, the servicing and collecting of loans made
20 under prior authority, the liquidation of assets transferred
21 to Farmers' Home Administration pursuant to the Farmers'
22 Home Administration Act of 1946, the extension of financial
23 assistance under the Housing Act of 1949, and the adminis-
24 tration of assets transferred under subsection 2 (f) of the
25 Act of May 3, 1950, $27,500,000, together with a transfer

1 to this appropriation item of not to exceed $230,000 of the
2 fees and administrative expense charges made available by
3 subsections (d) and (e) of section 12 of the Bankhead-
4 Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended.

5 FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

6 For necessary expenses, including library membership
7 fees or dues in organizations which issue publications to
8 members only or to members at a lower price than to others,
9 payment for which may be made in advance; not to exceed
10 $20,000 for expenditures authorized by section 602 of the
11 Organic Act of 1944 (12 U. S. C. 833); $300,000, to-
12 gether with not to exceed $2,325,000 of receipts from Farm
13 Credit agencies, to be advanced to this appropriation, to cover
14 the cost of supervision, facilities, examinations, and other
15 services rendered to such agencies; $2,625,000.

16 EXTENSION SERVICE

17 PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, ALASKA, AND PUERTO RICO

18 For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto
19 Rico, for cooperative agricultural extension work as follows:

20 Capper-Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts:
21 Capper-Ketcham Act, the Act approved May 22, 1928 (7
22 U. S. C. 343a, 343b), $1,480,000; Bankhead-Jones Act,
23 section 21, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7
24 U. S. C. 343c), $12,000,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, sec-
25 tion 23, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935, as

1 amended by the Act of June 6, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 343d–1),
2 $12,500,000; additional extension work, the Act approved
3 April 24, 1939, as amended (7 U. S. C. 343c–1), $555,000;
4 Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C.
5 386c), extending the benefits of the Smith-Lever Act to the
6 Territory of Alaska, $13,950, and the Act approved Octo-
7 ber 27, 1949 (7 U. S. C. 343d–4, 5), extending to
8 the Territory of Alaska the benefits of the Capper-
9 Ketcham Act and sections 21 and 23 of title II of
10 the Bankhead-Jones Act, $42,150; Puerto Rico, section 3
11 of the Act of March 4, 1931 (7 U. S. C. 386f), author-
12 izing extension of the Capper-Ketcham Act to Puerto Rico,
13 $31,348; the Act approved August 28, 1937 (7 U. S. C.
14 343f–343g), extending the benefits of section 21 of the
15 Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, $408,000, and the Act
16 approved October 26, 1949 (7 U. S. C. 343d–2, 3), ex-
17 tending the benefits of section 23 of title II of the Bank-
18 head-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, $71,502; and section 506a
19 of title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U. S. C. 1476),
20 $33,050; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and
21 Puerto Rico, $27,135,000.
22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES
23 For expenses necessary to administer the provisions of
24 the Smith-Lever Act, approved May 8, 1914 (7 U. S. C.
25 341–348), and Acts amendatory or supplementary thereto,

1 and to coordinate the extension work of the Department and
2 the several States, Territories, and insular possessions,
3 $880,000.

4 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

5 For expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agricul-
6 ture, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle
7 for replacement only; travel expenses, including examina-
8 tion of estimates for appropriations in the field; stationery,
9 supplies, materials, and equipment; freight, express, and
10 drayage charges; advertising, communication service, post-
11 age, washing towels, repairs and alterations, and other
12 miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided
13 for and necessary for the practical and efficient work
14 of the Department of Agriculture, $2,157,200, together
15 with such amounts from other appropriations or author-
16 izations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget
17 for the current fiscal year for such services and expenses,
18 which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be de-
19 termined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $109,280,
20 shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation:
21 *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appro-
22 priations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall
23 at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated,
24 respectively, therefor in the budget for such year, the
25 amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this

1 appropriation shall be increased or decreased in such amounts
2 as the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with
3 representatives of the Department, shall determine are ap-
4 propriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions
5 or increases in such appropriations or authorizations.

6 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

7 For necessary expenses, including payment of fees or
8 dues for the use of law libraries by attorneys in the field
9 service, $2,200,000, together with such amounts from other
10 appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the
11 schedules in the budget for the current fiscal year for such
12 expenses which several amounts not exceeding a total of
13 $207,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of this
14 appropriation.

15 OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

16 For necessary expenses for the Office of Foreign Agri-
17 cultural Relations and for enabling the Secretary to coordi-
18 nate and integrate activities of the Department in connec-
19 tion with foreign agricultural work, including the purchase
20 of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only,
21 $600,000.

22 OFFICE OF INFORMATION

23 For necessary expenses in connection with the publica-
24 tion, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins, docu-
25 ments, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and dis-

1 play of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and exhibits,
2 and the coordination of informational work and programs
3 authorized by Congress in the Department, $1,271,000,
4 together with such amounts from other appropriations
5 or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in
6 the Budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses,
7 which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be deter-
8 mined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $16,200,
9 shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation,
10 of which total appropriation amounts not exceeding those
11 specified may be used for the purposes enumerated as fol-
12 lows: For preparation and display of exhibits, $104,725;
13 for preparation, distribution, and display of motion and
14 sound pictures, $75,600; for farmers' bulletins, which
15 shall be adapted to the interests of the people of the
16 different sections of the country, an equal proportion
17 of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or sent out under
18 the addressed franks furnished by the Senators, Representa-
19 tives, and Delegates in Congress, as they shall direct (7
20 U. S. C. 417) and not less than two hundred thirty thousand
21 eight hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Senate and
22 House of Representatives of part 2 of the annual report of
23 the Secretary (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture),
24 as authorized by section 73 of the Act of January 12, 1895
25 (44 U. S. C. 241), $611,128: *Provided,* That additional

1 funds for preparation and display of agricultural motion
2 pictures and exhibits relating to the programs of the various
3 agencies of the Department authorized by Congress, not
4 exceeding $150,000, may be transferred to and made a
5 part of this appropriation, from the funds applicable, and
6 shall be available for the objects specified herein: *Provided*
7 *further*, That in the preparation of motion pictures or exhibits
8 by the Department, not exceeding a total of $10,000 may
9 be used for employment pursuant to the second sentence of
10 section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C.
11 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
12 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further*, That no part
13 of this appropriation shall be used for the establishment or
14 maintenance of regional or State field offices, or for the com-
15 pensation of employees in such offices.

16 LIBRARY

17 For necessary expenses, including dues for library
18 membership in societies or associations which issue publica-
19 tions to members only or at a price to members lower than
20 to subscribers who are not members; $700,000.

21 TITLE II—SPECIAL ACTIVITIES

22 RESEARCH ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL AGRICULTURAL
23 MATERIALS

24 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry
25 out his responsibilities under section 7 (b) of the Strategic

1 and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of July 23, 1946
2 (50 U. S. C. 98f), $450,000: *Provided,* That this appro-
3 priation shall be subject to applicable provisions contained
4 in the item "Office of Administrator, Agricultural Research
5 Administration".

6 Eradication of Foot-and-Mouth Disease and Other Contagious
7 Diseases of Animals and Poultry, Agricultural Research
8 Administration

9 For expenses necessary in the arrest and eradication
10 of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuro-
11 pneumonia, or other contagious or infectious diseases of
12 animals, or European fowl pest and similar diseases in poul-
13 try, including the payment of claims growing out of past
14 and future purchases and destruction of animals (including
15 poultry) affected by or exposed to, or of materials con-
16 taminated by or exposed to, any such disease, wherever
17 found and irrespective of ownership, under like or substan-
18 tially similar circumstances, when such owner has complied
19 with all lawful quarantine regulations; and for foot-and-
20 mouth disease and rinderpest programs undertaken pur-
21 suant to the provisions of the Act of February 28, 1947, and
22 the Act of May 29, 1884, as amended (7 U. S. C. 391; 21
23 U. S. C. 111–122), including expenses in accordance with
24 section 2 of said Act of February 28, 1947, the Secretary may
25 transfer from other appropriations or funds available to the

1 bureaus, corporations, or agencies of the Department such
2 sums as he may deem necessary, to be available only in an
3 emergency which threatens the livestock or poultry industry
4 of the country, and any unexpended balances of funds trans-
5 ferred under this head in the next preceding fiscal year shall
6 be merged with such transferred amounts: *Provided*, That,
7 except for payments made pursuant to said Act of Febru-
8 ary 28, 1947, the payment for such animals hereafter pur-
9 chased may be made on appraisement based on the meat,
10 egg-production, dairy, or breeding value, but in case of ap-
11 praisement based on breeding value no appraisement of any
12 such animal shall exceed three times its meat, egg-produc-
13 tion, or dairy value, and, except in case of an extraordinary
14 emergency, to be determined by the Secretary, the pay-
15 ment by the United States Government for any such animals
16 shall not exceed one-half of any such appraisements: *Pro-*
17 *vided further*, That poultry may be appraised in groups
18 when the basis for appraisal is the same for each bird: *Pro-*
19 *vided further*, That this appropriation shall be subject to
20 applicable provisions contained in the item "Office of Ad-
21 ministrator, Agricultural Research Administration": *Pro-*
22 *vided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby
23 authorized and directed to discharge indebtedness of the
24 Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the
25 Treasury by cancelling notes issued by the Corporation to

1 the Secretary of the Treasury in the amount of $32,700,000
2 for funds transferred and expenses incurred under this head
3 through fiscal year 1950 pursuant to authority granted in the
4 Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1950.

5 INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

6 The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and
7 directed to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit
8 Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury by cancelling
9 notes issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the
10 Treasury in the amount of $76,808,000 for the net costs
11 during the fiscal year 1950 under the International Wheat
12 Agreement Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C. 1641–1642).

13 TITLE III—CORPORATIONS

14 The following corporations and agencies are hereby au-
15 thorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of
16 funds and borrowing authority available to each such cor-
17 poration or agency and in accord with law, and to make
18 such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal
19 year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Gov-
20 ernment Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be
21 necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in
22 the budget for the fiscal year 1952 for such corporation or
23 agency, except as hereinafter provided:

24 Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

25 Commodity Credit Corporation: Nothing in this Act

1 shall be so construed as to prevent the Commodity Credit
2 Corporation from carrying out any activity or any program
3 authorized by law: *Provided,* That not to exceed $15,000,000
4 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corpo-
5 ration: *Provided further,* That all necessary expenses (in-
6 cluding legal and special services performed on a contract
7 or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in
8 connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance,
9 improvement, or disposition of any real or personal prop-
10 erty belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an
11 interest, including expenses of collections of pledged col-
12 lateral, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses
13 for the purposes hereof: *Provided further,* That the Sec-
14 retary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed
15 to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corpo-
16 ration to the Secretary of the Treasury by canceling notes
17 issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury
18 in the amount of the capital impairment determined by the
19 appraisal of June 30, 1950 (but not to exceed $427,-
20 000,000), pursuant to sections 1 and 4 of the Act of
21 March 8, 1938, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a–1, 4).
22 Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation: Not to exceed
23 $1,100,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the
24 funds of the Corporation shall be available for administrative
25 expenses, including employment on a contract or fee basis of

1 persons, firms, and corporations for the performance of special
2 services, including legal services, and the use of the services
3 and facilities of Federal land banks, national farm loan asso-
4 ciations, Federal Reserve banks, and agencies of the Gov-
5 ernment as authorized by the Act of January 31, 1934
6 (12 U. S. C. 1020–1020h); and said total sum shall be
7 exclusive of services and facilities furnished and examina-
8 tions made by the Farm Credit Administration central
9 office, interest expense, and expenses in connection with
10 the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, pro-
11 tection, or disposition of real or personal property belong-
12 ing to the Corporation or in which it has an interest:
13 *Provided,* That promptly after June 30 of each fiscal year
14 all cash funds in excess of the estimated operating require-
15 ments for the current fiscal year shall be declared as divi-
16 dends and paid into the general fund of the Treasury: *Pro-*
17 *vided further,* That the aggregate amount of bonds the
18 Corporation may issue and have outstanding at any one time
19 shall not exceed $500,000,000.

20 Federal intermediate credit banks: Not to exceed
21 $1,496,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis)
22 of the funds of the banks shall be available for
23 administrative expenses and services performed for the
24 banks by other Government agencies (except services and
25 facilities furnished and examinations made by the Farm

1 Credit Administration central office, and services performed
2 by any Federal Reserve bank and by the United States
3 Treasury in connection with the financial transactions of
4 the banks) ; and said total sum shall be exclusive of interest
5 expense, legal and special services performed on a contract
6 or fee basis, and expenses in connection with the acquisition,
7 operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or dis-
8 position of real or personal property belonging to the banks
9 or in which they have an interest.

10 Production credit corporations: Not to exceed $1,-
11 358,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the
12 funds of the corporations shall be available for ad-
13 ministrative expenses and services performed for the cor-
14 porations by other Government agencies (except services
15 and facilities furnished and examinations made by the Farm
16 Credit Administration central office) ; and said total sum
17 shall be exclusive of interest expense, legal and special
18 services performed on a contract or fee basis, and expenses
19 in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance,
20 improvement, protection, or disposition of real or personal
21 property belonging to the corporations or in which they
22 have an interest.

23 TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

24 SEC. 401. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by
25 law, the lump-sum appropriations and authorizations made

1 for the Department under this Act shall be available for
2 the purchase, in addition to those specifically provided for,
3 of not to exceed 497 passenger motor vehicles for
4 replacement only, and for the hire of such vehicles, necessary
5 in the conduct of the work of the Department outside the
6 District of Columbia.

7 SEC. 402. Provisions of law prohibiting or re-
8 stricting the employment of aliens shall not apply to (1)
9 the temporary employment of translators when competent
10 citizen translators are not available; (2) employment in
11 cases of emergency of persons in the field service of the
12 Department for periods of not more than sixty days; and
13 (3) employment under the appropriation for the Office of
14 Foreign Agricultural Relations.

15 SEC. 403. Of appropriations herein made which
16 are available for the purchase of lands, not to exceed $1
17 may be expended for each option to purchase any partic-
18 ular tract or tracts of land.

19 SEC. 404. No part of the funds appropriated
20 by this Act shall be used for the payment of any officer
21 or employee of the Department who, as such officer or
22 employee, or on behalf of the Department or any division,
23 commission, or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued,
24 any prediction, oral or written, or forecast, except as to

1 damage threatened or caused by insects and pests, with
2 respect to future prices of cotton or the trend of same.
3 SEC. 405. Except to provide materials required
4 in or incident to research or experimental work where no
5 suitable domestic product is available, no part of the funds
6 appropriated by this Act shall be expended in the
7 purchase of twine manufactured from commodities or mate-
8 rials produced outside of the United States.
9 SEC. 406. Not less than $575,000 shall be avail-
10 able for contracts in accordance with section 10 (a)
11 of the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427i) from
12 appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Agricultural
13 Economics; Bureau of Animal Industry; Bureau of Dairy
14 Industry; Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural
15 Engineering; Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine;
16 Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry; Bureau of
17 Human Nutrition and Home Economics; and the Forest
18 Service.
19 SEC. 407. No part of the funds made available by this
20 Act may be used to compensate any person for employ-
21 ment in the Federal service outside the continental limits
22 of the United States at a rate higher than is paid for com-
23 parable work in the Federal service within the continental
24 limits of the United States, other than a person who was

1 a resident citizen of the continental United States at the
2 date of his appointment to a position outside the continental
3 limits of the United States and has had continuous employ-
4 ment in the Federal service (except as interrupted by serv-
5 ice in the Armed Forces of the United States) from the
6 date of such appointment.

7 SEC. 408. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law,
8 the Department is hereby authorized hereafter to employ or
9 otherwise contract with persons at regular rates of pay for
10 necessary hours of work for emergency forest fire fighting and
11 pest control and for handling of animals, including dairy
12 cattle, without regard to Sundays, Federal holidays, and
13 the regular workweek.

14 SEC. 409. No part of any appropriation contained in
15 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any cor-
16 poration included in this Act, shall be used to pay the salary
17 or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the
18 Government of the United States or who is a member of an
19 organization of Government employees that asserts the right
20 to strike against the Government of the United States, or who
21 advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates,
22 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by
23 force or violence: *Provided,* That for the purposes hereof an
24 affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the
25 person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions

1 of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of
2 the United States, is not a member of an organization of
3 Government employees that asserts the right to strike against
4 the Government of the United States, or that such person
5 does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization
6 that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the
7 United States by force or violence: *Provided further,* That
8 any person who engages in a strike against the Government
9 of the United States or who is a member of an organization
10 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike
11 against the Government of the United States, or who advo-
12 cates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates,
13 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by
14 force or violence and accepts employment the salary or
15 wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund
16 contained in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon
17 conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned
18 for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further,* That
19 the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in
20 substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Pro-*
21 *vided further,* That nothing in this section shall be construed
22 to require an affidavit from any person employed for less
23 than sixty days for sudden emergency work involving the
24 loss of human life or destruction of property, the payment

1 of salary or wages may be made to such persons from ap-
2 plicable appropriations for services rendered in such emer-
3 gency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by
4 this section.

5 SEC. 410. This Act may be cited as the "Department
6 of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1952".

Union Calendar No. 111

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

[Report No. 421]

A BILL

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

By Mr. WHITTEN

MAY 4, 1951

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

SUSPENDING CERTAIN IMPORT TAXES ON COPPER

Mr. MILLS, from the Committee on Ways and Means, submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3336) to suspend certain import taxes on copper, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 428)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3336) to suspend certain import taxes on copper, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses, as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2 and 3.

That the Senate recede from its amendment to the title of the bill.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
WILBUR D. MILLS,
DANIEL A. REED,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
RICHARD M. SIMPSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
TOM CONNALLY,
HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
E. D. MILLIKIN,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3336) to suspend certain import taxes on copper, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

Amendment No. 1: This amendment provides that the suspension of the import taxes on copper shall end prior to February 15, 1953, in the event of termination prior to said date of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3: These amendments provide for the free importation of twine chiefly used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding materials, effective as to merchandise entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption beginning on the 30th day after the enactment of the bill. The Senate recedes.

Amendment to the title: The Senate recedes.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
WILBUR D. MILLS,
DANIEL A. REED,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
RICHARD M. SIMPSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill continue throughout today, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and myself, and that at least the first paragraph of the bill be read before the Committee rises.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would not like to leave in the minds of the membership that we do not intend to go along with the bill today if we can; I would like the Members to understand that if we can continue with the reading of the bill it is our intention to do so, provided all requests for time under general debate can be taken care of.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is correct.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. One further point, if the gentleman from Mississippi will permit: It is understood that the general debate shall be confined to things having to do with the bill and with agriculture.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is correct, too.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request under those unusual circumstances?

There was no objection

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3973, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I hope as many as can will listen to the opening discussion of this bill, because I think it comes up at a time when we certainly should give every consideration to the problems which we try to meet through the Department of Agriculture.

I would like to preface my remarks by paying tribute to my colleagues on this committee. The gentleman from Oklahoma, BILL STIGLER, and the gentleman from Kentucky, JOE BATES, are two of the outstanding members of this House. They are vitally interested in agriculture and are able, sincere and above all, courageous and independent. The Republican members, the gentleman from Minnesota, CARL ANDERSEN, and the gentleman from Washington, WALT HORAN, are numbered among the leaders on the Republican side of the House of Representatives. We have joined in our efforts to do a good job in handling this problem of recommending to you this chapter on agriltural appropriations. In our work we have had the services of a fine administrative secretary, Ross Pope, serving his second year with our committee, and one of the ablest men in his field.

This bill includes direct annual appropriations of $720,157,433, loan funds for the Rural Electrification Administration and Farmers Home Administration of $251,250,000 and administrative expense authorizations for the corporations of the Department of $18,954,000. The amount recommended for direct appropriation is $52,742,260 less than funds available for 1951 and $99,848,113 less than the estimates for 1942. The loan funds authorized are $193,250,000 less than amounts available for 1951 and $10,750,000 below the 1952 estimates, and administrative expense limitations are $1,530,000 below the authorizations for 1951 and $5,200,000 under the estimates for 1952.

In view of the fact that we are again in a period of defense preparedness, it seems appropriate to compare the appriations and personnel provided for herein with those for the period just prior to World War II. The appropriations for the Department for each of the 3 years preceding the last war were in excess of $1,000,000,000. The amount provided in 1941 was $1,543,000,000, more than twice the amount of $720,157,433 recommended in the 1952 bill.

This comparison has particular significance when it is realized that the 1952 funds cover many new activities such as the school-lunch program, the rural-telephone program, the farm-housing program, and the Research and Marketing Act, which were not in existence in 1941. It is also impressive in view of the increase of from 100 to 200 percent in the cost of most of the items required by the Department, the fact that legislation has increased salaries nearly 50 percent, and the fact that much of the work for which funds were made available during the last war by transfer from defense appropriations is being performed by the Department during the current emergency within its regular funds.

You will not find a comparable record in all the governmental departments. We are proud of that record. However, in my judgment the committee bill might well have provided more funds in some places and I am sure other individual Members have individual views with regard to some items.

In one short year, our subcommittee and the Department of Agriculture has had its problems completely reversed. One year ago we were troubled with surpluses, what to do with them, and how should they be handled so as not to start our Nation on the downward spiral of inflation, agriculture pulling everything down with it as happened before. At that time, in speaking of the Commodity Credit operations, I stated that these surpluses could be a blessing in time of peace and a lifesaver in time of war.

We deplore the tragedy of war but we are thankful for the supplies of many commodities we have had on hand. Except for such supplies we would have been many times worse off than we are. Today with regard to most commodities we have the greatest production in history. Yet, with the increased demand we find we need even more. Today we are facing real war with threats of an even larger one. Millions of our boys are in the service and millions more are to follow.

This Congress will support military appropriations almost without question, even though many times questions should be raised as to whether a large

part of the funds really reach the objective. I would like to point out that we are also dependent upon agricultural production to feed those troops, to provide food, clothing, and shelter for our civilian population, and, yes, for use in our foreign policy.

Farmers have been requested to greatly expand their production. This expanded production calls for increases in 1951 over 1950 of 10,000,000 acres of cotton—54-percent increase—5,600,000 acres of corn, 3,000,000 acres of wheat, and 300,000 acres of rice. Every evidence indicates that the farmer is responding wholeheartedly to this situation and is doing everything possible to assure abundant food supplies for the future. This committee is proud to be dealing with a segment of our economy which is making this significant contribution to the defense effort.

The committee is concerned somewhat, however, lest this patriotic effort result in serious damage to the position of the average farmer throughout the country. The farmer is not only depleting the fertility of the soil as a result of such intensive cultivation, but is also endangering the selling price of his commodities through the large expansion in production which in a short time might result in surpluses.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. In connection with the statement just made that we are asking the farmers to grow 3,000,000 acres more of food, will the gentleman explain to the House or to the committee the increase of $38,000,000 for the removal of surplus agricultural products?

Mr. WHITTEN. There is no such increase in the bill.

Mr. DONDERO. Over 1951 there is.

Mr. WHITTEN. Section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act provides that 30 percent of the import duties are set aside for the handling of surplus commodities and to promote new uses thereof. The figure the gentleman refers to is an estimate of how much the 30 percent of the import duties on commodities coming into this country will be.

Mr. DONDERO. It is confusing and deceiving to read.

Mr. WHITTEN. It is confusing, but it is an estimate of what 30 percent of the import duties will be in a given year, and it varies from year to year. That, too, is one of the problems we face.

Mr. Chairman, there is no pride of authorship here. I do not own the Department of Agriculture and I think my handling of this bill through the years has indicated that the Department does not own me. But I have worked for about 8 years on this committee, and this year we worked about 4 months on this bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture. We are proud of the record that that Department—and our committee has had a small part in it—has made in holding down public expenditures and certainly we need to hold them down. As pointed out earlier, for the 3 years preceding the last war the general appropriations for the Department of Agriculture were in excess of a billion dollars. In 1941 the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture were $1,500,000,000. In this bill we have less than half that amount, $720,000,000.

I have seen this House in the last few weeks vote for economy measures many times. I, too, am for economy; but I want to point out to you that we have an economical bill here today. If you will check the records of this Department in the last 10 years you will find that the personnel has been reduced from 108,000 to 70,000. I may say to you also that the funds we recommend in this bill, notwithstanding the problems agriculture is faced with, provide for a further reduction of about 4,000 people in the Department, and 6,000 persons connected with the county committees, who are not considered as Federal employees.

The point that I desire to make to you at this time is you have a bill before you that the committee, acting in its best judgment after months and months of hearings, has produced wherein we have gone as far as we can afford to go under present conditions. We have a serious task in this country if we are to have increased production. Let us look at what the farmers are called upon to do in regard to meeting national defense problems as compared with other segments of our economy. In regard to the basic commodities, the farmer is assured 90 percent of parity. I would like to point out that parity never was and never has been a definition of a fair price. Parity was created by the Congress in an effort to set a floor under certain basic commodities so that the bottom would not fall out of those prices. Ninety percent of parity is similar to the 75-cent minium wage, which is not accepted by labor as being a fair wage but as the floor. Average wages in this country run about $1.25.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I think the Congress should know that most of the agricultural activities are exempted from the provisions of the 75-cent minimum. I think the gentleman is unfair in regard to his statement about labor.

Mr. WHITTEN. I think the gentleman misunderstood me, or I hope he did, because certainly this is not an attack on the gentleman's views at all. I merely say that the minimum wage is not the average wage, but is a floor, and that 90 percent of parity for farm production is very similar to it. The average wage runs about $1.25, and if the price of agricultural products were on a comparative basis, it would be substantially above parity.

Now, in regard to this increase in commodities: For whose benefit are we increasing the supply of cotton, the supply of corn, the supply of wheat, the supply of rice? These huge quantities of these commodities that the farmers are being called upon to build up if the present emergency should end tomorrow—and God knows we hope that peace will soon be here—would be a depressing influence on the price of every commodity that would be involved, and yet we ask the farmers under those conditions to do that, and I am proud to say that in their patriotism, so far as we can find out, they are going the whole way in their efforts to meet these production demands, despite difficulties.

Did you ever try to run a dairy when you had about half enough labor, or to increase your cotton acreage when most of your boys had gone into the service and when you could not get an adequate number of tractors and other things that it takes to operate a farm? It is hard to keep production at the present level, much less increase it.

I just finished hearings a few weeks ago on a special committee dealing with the national defense production. Do you know how we handled this problem for industry? We provide for Government loans to enlarge the operation of factories. We provide that the factory can depreciate in 5 years the entire initial cost. We provide firm contracts where the Government takes at cost, plus a reasonable profit, the output of such a factory. This is no complaint at that, but it is to point out to you the differences that exist between what we call on the various segments of our economy to do.

Now you may say that this increased production is for the farmer's benefit. I tried to show you that he is not guaranteed under the price control law even the cost of production. The Price Control Administrator can fix the price without regard to cost under the law. Parity is fixed without regard to what it may have cost him. No; this increase that we are asking the farmer to make is largely for the benefit of the consumers of this Nation; you and me. The farmer is going to grow enough of these commodities for his own use, but we are the ones that are dependent upon the amount that is over and beyond what the farmer grows to meet his own need. We all have an interest in the Department of Agriculture. You may say that the Department of Agriculture is for the benefit of the farmers, and goodness knows that they do render to the farmer real benefits. But the prime benefits there, the major benefits, go to the consuming public which is dependent upon the amount of agricultural production.

The committee is proud of the American agriculture and the farmer. We are proud of the work that has been done by the Department of Agriculture and the benefits of which flow through the farmer to the Nation. We know the complaint that is made of the high cost of many things, including farm products. A study, however, shows that the amount paid to the farmer out of the average income has not increased anything like proportionately to increases that have gone to transportation and processing and handling of farmers' products after they leave the farmers' hands. It once was that about all the farmer had to have to farm was the land, a few buildings, a few animals, and inexpensive farm equipment. In fact in 1907 on a survey in New York State it was found that about 74 percent of the farmers' investment was the land, and only 26 percent improvements. The cost of making the

crop was reasonable and in fact it would have taken the farmer approximately 9½ years for the expense of operations to equal his investment in the farm. That picture has now changed and farming has become a much more hazardous occupation notwithstanding increased rates for the farm products. In a survey in the same area in 1947 it was found that the farm investment was only 45 percent land and 55 percent improvements and that the cost of operations would equal the value of the farm in a little over 2 years. In other words, now a farmer can lose his farm at least three or four times as quickly as back in 1907. In the period 1907 to 1947 the income on the farm increased nine times. But the expense of operation increased 14 times. These facts are mentioned not to justify any needless expenditure on the part of the Department of Agriculture. But there are many things that are done by the Department of Agriculture which are vital to all.

What part does the Department of Agriculture play in connection with farming in this country? If the cattle that we have in this country today were the kind that our forefathers had more than 50 years ago, we would not have half as much meat as we now have. If the dairy animals of this country were the kind we had 50 years ago we would not have half as much milk and butter as we now have. If the poultry were the same as we had about 50 years ago, we would not have half the egg production. These things are accepted and taken for granted even by the farmer; but if you will check behind it you will find that the year-by-year research on the part of the Department of Agriculture is behind most of this improvement. Much research has been carried forward by private people, but most of the improvement is due to the activities of the Department of Agriculture.

From time to time we have brought into this country insects and diseases from foreign countries. We have to have an Inspection Service to control the imports and to inspect planes and ships and other things that come in here. The record showed last year that one out of every four inspected brought in something that would have been harmful to the supplies of the various commodities we have in this country, and would have wrecked the farmers that were engaged in farming that particular type of product. It would also have wrecked the rest of us who are dependent upon the production of those farmers.

We have seen what this thing will do in regard to the hoof-and-mouth disease in Mexico, where it literally destroyed hundreds of thousands of animals. We have had two or three outbreaks of it in this country.

Many years ago we had the barberry bush which was brought in here from Japan, I believe. We have had a constant effort to try to eradicate it since, because various types of wheat rust live on this barberry bush. Today we are losing millions and millions of dollars of wheat production because of rust which lives in these barberry bushes.

We have case after case where it is a continuing fight by the Department of Agriculture to maintain production. Next year we are asking the farmers and the Department to promote it. We are asking them to increase their output.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I am very much interested in what the gentleman says with regard to agricultural research, as I feel our fundamental problems in agriculture are going to be solved on that basis. Does the gentleman feel that adequate funds are being appropriated here for agricultural research as such?

Mr. WHITTEN. Sometimes I wonder if there is enough money in the world to do all the things that need to be done, and I would have to say that about research. However, I would ask all of you, before you vote to reduce this bill further, to compare the figures in the bill with last year, with 10 years ago, and with any bill that has passed before you in this Congress. We have made reductions throughout this bill, some with regard to research.

With so many men being called into the Armed Forces and others into other defense work, we feel that there will to some extent be a shortage of trained personnel to carry on the basic research. In addition, a considerable part of research in the Department has to do with promoting new markets and seeking outlets for agricultural products. At a time like this, when there is a demand for everything the farmer grows, we feel that some of this work can be curtailed. Why seek outlets for surpluses you do not have? It is along that line that we have made an average of about a 10-percent reduction in research funds. It does not come from any lack of confidence and belief in research.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I may say in answer to the gentleman's question that the word "research" is a very popular word. We believe in it also. However, many of the items on research were some of the most difficult for the subcommittee to justify.

Mr. WHITTEN. They certainly are. I would like to take this occasion to say, after counseling with my friend, the gentleman from the State of Washington, a member of the subcommittee, the report does state that the committee intended the funds for the expansion of outlets be reduced by 50 percent. We do feel that a greater part of the reduction should be placed on the expansion of outlets due to these changed conditions, but we do feel that the Department should have some latitude in applying reductions to all projects under the appropriation within the total amount recommended.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Would the gentleman explain the meaning of the language in the bill where it says, "Research on strategic and critical materials"? What is meant by that? Does that mean materials for war purposes, or does it mean critical foodstuffs?

Mr. WHITTEN. In effect it means research for war purposes. In that connection we are carrying on most of this research at the request of the Munitions Board. We are carrying on certain rubber research projects and other projects like tanning, which is so essential to curing leather. We have lost our chestnut trees which used to be used for that purpose, and it is absolutely necessary to find some other source of material. We are also carrying on some research with regard to vegetable oils which are important to the military. Another project has to do with cordage, to work out some substitute for hemp.

Mr. JOHNSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the gentleman, in the course of his very interesting presentation, deal with the subject of conservation and use of agricultural land resources to which $256,500 is provided from this point of view. I have read a good deal, including a very interesting editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, a paper in the farm area, about the fact that these conservation payments need not be made and the farmers will take care of their own problems if their income permits, and as their interests require.

Mr. WHITTEN. I will be glad to discuss that subject when we come to it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. On pages 50 and 51 are set forth the amounts of the notes which are authorized to be canceled, which are given by the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury. The total of those notes, as the result of the International Wheat Agreement, and under the Commodity Credit Corporation generally, amounts to approximately $500,000,000. Is it a fair statement to say that that represents the losses in the Commodity Credit Corporation during the last year?

Mr. WHITTEN. No; that has given this committee a great deal of trouble. Unfortunately, one of the handiest tills in the Government is the Commodity Credit Corporation. Every time you want somebody to move in and handle something about which they have nothing to do, you say, "Let the Commodity Credit Corporation handle it and we will repay them." That was true of the consumers' subsidies during the war, and it has been true of many things. The Commodity Credit Corporation, for instance, has nothing in the world to do with the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico, but administratively they were assigned the task of being the paymaster and meeting the obligations. The International Wheat Agreement, in my opinion, never has been an agricultural program. As to whether it is wise or unwise in connection with our foreign policy, each man can draw his own conclusion. But under the International Wheat Agreement we sell to foreign

countries a great deal of wheat far below what it costs us to get it. That is what this money represents. The International Wheat Agreement was not voted on in the House. It was an agreement that was approved by the other body, but that is not a Commodity Credit Corportion operation. This wheat did not come from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks at all. They were directed to go out and buy the wheat and supply it for this International Wheat Agreement.

Mr. KEATING. Seventy-six million dollars of the amount I have spoken of is represented by that?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate of course what the gentleman says, but I do think, from the point of view of the taxpayers, that we ought to know what the actual amount is that they are being saddled with, and what the reason for it is.

Mr. WHITTEN. I have always gone to extreme lengths to set up the different operations separately so that that could be easily seen. I have done it for a number of reasons. There have been some complaints about its actual operation, but certainly they should not be saddled with this, where they are the administrative officers of the Government under some law that we have passed.

Mr. KEATING. Under this wheat agreement is it a fair statement to say that they purchased the wheat at a certain figure and then sold it at a lesser figure, and that the $76,000,000 represents the difference?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right, but if they are permitted under the law to sell the wheat for what it is worth, they would make a considerable profit. However, they are bound by the international wheat agreement and the directions of Congress. If they were permitted to buy the wheat and resell it under the conditions we have had prevailing the last year, they would have made an enormous profit.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate that. On the other item of $426,000,000, can the gentleman tell us what amount of that would be fairly attributable to losses as a result of the farm price-support program?

Mr. WHITTEN. I believe I would like to cover that as I come to it in my statement.

Mr. KEATING. I have two or three other questions. Would the gentleman prefer me to wait?

Mr. WHITTEN. Let me go ahead, if you will, and if I do not cover it in my general statement, I will take the time to do it.

We have many activities in the Department of Agriculture. For instance, we have the Rural Electrification Administration, under which the Government provides for Government loans to local cooperatives. This agency has one of the finest records you will find anywhere in the world. About 86 percent of the farmers today have electricity. That electricity and the lines which go to the farmers' houses is being paid for with interest. Less than three-tenths of 1 percent of those borrowers are as much as 30 days in arrears in repayment. Today, when those of us in our cities and those of us in Congress are dependent upon productivity and the production of farms, a big share of the production we are going to get comes from the fact that we have electricity on the farms. It works in connection with the dairy farming. It works in connection with poultry. It works in connection with many, many phases of agriculture.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. We had 86.3 percent of the farms of this country electrified on June 30, last. Today it is about 90 percent.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am glad to have the gentleman's figures.

Through the Farmers Home Administration we have made it possible for many small farmers to become farm owners, whereby they could make a real contribution not only to the well-being of their families and its contribution to society as good citizens, but have enabled them to add to the national production of food, fiber, and clothing. The record of repayment here is excellent and collections exceed expenditures for each year we are now collecting more than we pay out.

We have provided for the Farm Credit Administration, which has kept a healthy credit structure and which has made it possible for farms to continue to operate in time when there was hardly any way for them to continue otherwise. This credit structure has had its effect upon interest rates and loan terms. It also has not lost any money for the Government, and now is largely farmer-owned with the notes of such farm credit structure finding a ready market without any Government guaranty whatsoever.

It has proven so successful that it is operating now on a level that I think all of you can be justifiably proud of.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. DEANE. I was impressed with what the gentleman said about the Farmers' Home Administration, and I note in the report that the committee has made a rather drastic reduction, but they say they do not believe this will impair the program. I, too, with the chairman, have been greatly impressed with the work of the Farmers' Home Administration under the capable leadership of Mr. Lasseter. Knowing that this program spreads out all over the country, I wonder if the gentleman would discuss a little more in detail that program.

Mr. RANKIN. Before the gentleman gets to that may I ask him a question?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I notice that the committee provides $100,000,000 for rural electrification, for the fiscal year beginning July 1. How much did the Rural Electrification Administration ask for?

Mr. WHITTEN. The Rural Electrification Administration asked for the $100,000,000; however, we followed the plan we have had in the past of permitting them to use additional money if that should be exhausted. The Budget, however, sent down a recommendation that the committee abolish the present formula of distribution which each State is entitled to certain amounts of whatever funds are made available. The committee could not see that at all. Certainly the formula was put in there so that all States would have an opportunity to share in the funds of this organization; and that being true we kept the formula, and in view of keeping the formula they will have the same formula they have today.

I will ask, Mr. Chairman, not to be interrupted for a few minutes in order that I may complete my presentation; then I shall be pleased to answer any questions as best I may.

With regard to the Farmers' Home Administration, the question has been raised here about reductions in the appropriation. Notwithstanding the fact that I have tried to point out the absolute essentiality of agriculture and agricultural production, we did recognize that in this time with a debt of $270,000,000,000 that we should make further reductions where possible, and we have tried to do that. There are many figures in here that we would like to have seen larger, based on the importance of the work. But first things must come first, and your committee has in my judgment made every cut that we could justify in view of the over-all demands upon this large segment of our economy at this time.

We have various control programs which have to be carried on in the Department of Agriculture. Periodically we have outbreaks of pink bollworm in the cotton areas of the South, and now, when the production of cotton is so essential, it is absolutely imperative that we do the best we can to keep down this pest. I am proud to say that in connection with that control program the people of the States have supplied nine-tenths of the funds and the Federal Government has only paid out one-tenth of the cost. We have control programs for the outbreak of other pests in connection with our forests; we have got to give attention to controlling those pests or our supply of lumber will get shorter and shorter. The same thing with regard to the grasshoppers in the West where migrations threaten to destroy field crops in that area. All this comes under this great Department of Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi has consumed 30 minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 additional minutes.

Questions have been asked here with regard to the operation of the soil-conservation program. You know, in times like this when taxes are high and debts are high and the demand for the tax dollar is so great, when the demands on the farmer himself are so tremendous because he has a shortage of labor and a shortage of capital, the natural thing is to let things go by the board. There are lots of farmers who feel that it is no longer essential to give any attention to soil conservation. However, if you check the records of this country, you will find

you did not have one-tenth the attention paid to restoring and preserving the soil resources of this country until we started a Federal program. I could give you the figures to show that we have built millions and millions of terraces through this program; we have millions and millions and millions of ditches constructed through this program; we have many, many thousands of water pools in the pastures of this country built under this program; we could carry that further and show that about one-fifth of your livestock today is in existence because you made it possible to have more livestock on the pastures of this country.

But what I will tell you goes further than that. Because of this program and the publicity incident to it and the activities of those engaged in it, it has led the private individual to do the same thing on his own farm, which represents eight or ten times the amount of work done under this program.

I want to tell you something else, and I am as serious as I know how to be. To those who would condemn the soil conservation programs I would point out that practically every country that is in dire straits today has behind it a wasted soil. They have little on which to build in the way of natural resources. And as further evidence that our Nation recognizes its strength must rest upon its soil and natural resources we have through the ECA required many of these countries to spend hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars of counterpart funds in soil conservation and reforestation and for other similar projects, the purpose of which is to bring back the soil so that people can have food, clothing, and shelter, and having those can begin to restore the standard of living and well-being of their nation. The last census disclosed that we have had an increase of approximately 19,000,000 people in 10 years. Thirty or forty years from now you can easily see that the needs of our own population are going to be greatly expanded. Whether we maintain our high standard of living depends largely upon whether or not we have given proper attention to our soil, which means that we must plow back into it a reasonable part of that which we take from it. That is what a factory would do, that is what any kind of plant would do—set aside a share of its earnings for the purpose of maintaining its plant on a sound basis. This we must do with regard to our soil.

In this bill we provide $256,500,000 for ACP payments. This is exactly the amount that was carried in the appropriation bill last year after the Presidential reduction. We are well aware that an announcement was made last year of a $285,000,000 program. In the opinion of the committee this was an absolute commitment on the part of the Government. It is a debt that is owed to the extent that farmers have carried out their part. It is believed, however, by a majority of the committee, from the experience of last year's reduced amount that the amount in this bill may meet the Government's obligation under the commitment made last year in the announced program. However, the committee is of the opinion that since this announcement was made that constitutes a firm obligation, and if the present appropriation should not be sufficient to carry out the Government's contract on which the farmers have acted that they be authorized to draw on the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay off any obligations connected with last year's announcement. In other words it is hoped that this reduction can be made without in any way failing to carry out the Government's part in any program that has been performed. But in the event we be in error about that we want it clearly understood that the committee recommendations are that this commitment be fully carried out because it is a direct obligation of the Government. The farmers have to put up their share of the cost which is practically the same as the Government's and in addition have given their labor, all on announcement of the Congress in the appropriation bill of last year.

The announcement carried in the bill for next year's program is fixed at $225,000,000. Quite frankly this is less than I would prefer for this program but the committee in its joint judgment has yielded to the pressures for governmental expenditures to be reduced. Numerous farm organizations have requested reductions in this program. Speaking for myself and several other members of the committee I feel that instead of reducing expenditures for soil conservation we could well spend time in studying the present programs to see if we cannot obtain greater conservation of our natural resources. With regard to the Soil Conservation Service the committee has not made any reduction but has gone along with the budget figure. The reason for that is that under the recent reorganization act additional duties will be required of the Soil Conservation Service, and in addition there are close to 200 new districts which have been organized and which must be supplied with technical assistants from the over-all appropriation. It means that the personnel will have to be spread a little thinner and those of us who believe in real soil conservation are not too happy about this fact.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am just as disturbed as anybody here about the financial situation of this country. With a debt of $270,000,000,000 it is hard to conceive of any plan or program which will pull us out, any workable program where we can ever handle that kind of a debt in a proper way. But I know that if there is any way of handling it, it is going to be based upon maintaining our soil fertility and the productive capacity of this great Nation of ours. You may say, "Well, do not point out China, Italy and these other countries to me; we are not going to let our country go down to where they let theirs go down insofar as productive capacity is concerned." But if you will check the record of this great Nation of ours, you will find that we have wasted more soil in a shorter period of time than either one of those countries.

I could talk on and on about this program. Let me say that in spite of the demands that are being made on agriculture, in spite of the fact that the Department has been assigned the task of helping to get this increased production, your subcommittee has reduced the appropriations by approximately 12 percent. We are willing to stand by those reductions because they came after careful study and months of hearings; they came from a committee that has given real thought and real effort to trying to determine what we should do in view of all the conditions facing us. But, if you reduce it still further I do not believe you can justify it, and I say that you are taking a real chance. Perhaps we are taking one in reducing it as much as we have.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I want to ask this question at this point, because I am in complete accord with what the gentleman says about soil conservation upon which the future of this country depends. But, I want him to make it abundantly clear, on page 32 of the report, that soil conservation, the top item on the page, is Soil Conservation Service, and that when the item under PMA for the conservation and use of agricultural land uses is referred to as soil conservation, that is not the essential soil conservation, but the other one is. There is a discussion, as you know, at the present time, about that subject.

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes. The gentleman raises a question there, and I get lots of telephone calls from people asking about one when they mean the other. But, the language which the gentleman from California uses as to which is essential and which is not, is a matter of judgment. To me they are one and the same insofar as the objective is concerned. Soil Conservation Service provides the technical planning for the farmer. The Production and Marketing Administration provides Federal contributions toward the cost of soil conservation practices. I say that planning is no good without practices. It follows that practices are little good without planning. So, they are part and parcel of the soil conservation program of the Government, and I think they are both essential. I think that is borne out by the record, because when the production payment contribution was drastically curtailed a few years ago, we found that it was reflected in soil conservation work.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I think the gentleman has made a very fine statement about the problem involved in soil conservation, and I thank him for it. I wonder if he would go one step further, and that is that no farmer would be given the benefit under any other farm program unless he did practice soil conservation.

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, of course, my saying so would not make it so.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I appreciate that.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not know that I should go that far. I will say this, in regard to the Farmers Home Administration and various other activities of the Government. It has been the effort of our committee to insist that they do fully utilize these great services. The point that we frequently overlook here is that these conservation activities are the generating forces that are responsible for about nine-tenths of soil-conservation work, and it is carried on by the people in this country without going through the conservation program.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to ask the gentleman, in view of the fact that in his exhaustive and informative report, he does not comment on the item in line 13, on page 35, would the gentleman explain to the House just how the amount proposed to be appropriated there compares to last year's appropriation? Your report is silent on that item. Would you give us the information?

Mr. WHITTEN. That provides for payments to sugar producers as provided under the Sugar Act of 1948.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman. May I say that I find on page 15 a paragraph giving the details of that.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I notice on page 26 of the bill under the heading "Cooperative range management" the committee has recommended $700,000 to be expended, but includes a proviso that undoubtedly is legislation that the funds should not be spent unless they were matched either by the State or some public body or private individual.

I wonder if the gentleman is familiar with the fact that no person, no permitee, on a public range has any right. He is there only by sufferance, by lease. I am just wondering what the committee had in mind as to what public body and what individuals are going to match this fund in order to have the Government protect and improve its own property.

Mr. WHITTEN. I appreciate the gentleman's question and his problem. The story on this range improvement item is this:

The Federal Government owns the land. They lease it to the individual cattle or sheep grower for a fee. The folks who have run their cattle on there have insisted that the Government ought to—they call it "reseed," but in my country they call it "planting forage." I have never seen any obligation on the part of the farmer to plant forage. The Forest Service would like to do it, and they have always insisted on it. However, there is some merit to the fact that you could run more livestock in some instances if you did plant this forage crop.

The Forest Service, to my mind, has not been entirely fair with the committee. They have been collecting these grazing fees and paying them into the Treasury. From time to time I have asked them if it would not be wise to change the law so that they could retain some of those grazing fees for the purpose of reseeding. They have discussed that with me, as to whether we should change the law. About a year ago it developed that they have been doing it for 40 years, and the Comptroller General has ruled they have been doing it illegally. A bill was passed through the Congress to pay the States where the funds have been wrongfully withheld by the Forest Service. These States get 25 percent of the proceeds from the cattle running on the ranges, and they have gotten some of the benefits from having planted this forage on the ranges. The Budget approved a payment to those States of the amount of money which has been withheld and which might have been paid. We can either pay the States the amount of money they did not get from the 25 percent, or we can recognize it as an obligation and let them use it as matched funds.

The committee has advocated for several years, and has asked the legislative committee to pass legislation to set this up on a cooperative basis, so that we can have some yardstick to say how important this is. If the Federal Government pays it all it is hard to find a place in the country that does not want the work done. But if it could be put on a cooperative basis, then we could have some guide as to the merit of it, since they put up funds locally, that is a pretty good sign that there is something to it. It is along that line that we feel the States, and if not the States, the man who is running this cattle there should share this responsibility of planting feedstuffs on the ranges. We cannot vouch for the accuracy of our opinion, but that is our opinion and those are the facts upon which it is based.

Mr. GRANGER. I thank the gentleman. I think there is some reason for that, but to answer the gentleman's statement that he never heard of a landlord reseeding his pasture and furnishing feed, of course if he did not do that he would not have any pasture to rent. If there were no feed on the range, of course he would not be able to rent the range. That is the answer to the gentleman's statement. If there is no grass on the range, of course nobody would rent the pasture.

Mr. WHITTEN. I believe I used to word "obligation." I said I could not see where there is any obligation here. But I do think perhaps it is to the interest of the landlord and the man who is running his cattle there to work out a cooperative basis for providing this feed. That is what the committee is trying to do. The gentleman is correct; this is subject to a point of order. Of course, if the point of order is made to the last half, I would have to make a point of order against the first half of the provision.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Would it not be better for the Government to charge enough rent for the land so that it would have the funds with which to reseed the area?

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, if we get into this question of fees, that is perhaps true. Another way to work it out may be to have a smaller fee and let him do his own reseeding. In other words, there are a hundred ways to handle it. This happens to be the way the committee thought would probably be the best because it provides for joint contributions.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If the rentor of the range could have it for a long enough period of time, then it would be worth his while, and if the fee is made low enough, to go ahead and reseed the range.

Mr. WHITTEN. There is no reason why they could not reach that agreement.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, first I want to say I think the subcommittee has done a remarkably fine piece of work on a very difficult bill. I would like to ask a question with reference to the development of the amount the committee has inserted in the bill for administrative expenses of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I have studied the hearings and the data in the hearings, as well as the latest report of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I realize how difficult it is to arrive at any figure, since the information is not current. But I do not know from the report itself how it is that even though the committee felt $5,200,000 should be cut from the budget estimate, how it was they arrived at $15,000,000, for instance, in contrast to $13,000,000 or $14,000,000. I wonder if the gentleman could give us some information on that?

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman has had a great deal of experience in the Congress, and he certainly does not expect me to say that these figures are inviolate. Of course, I cannot say that, and there is no way to say that it should not be $14,999,999. It is an approximation based upon the testimony and the volume of business which the Commodity Credit Corporation has. As to how much of that money should be spent, it depends upon the volume of work which they will have. But, as I have pointed out, we are actually demanding that the farmers double their production in many places. If we should have peace, almost overnight we will have many, many commodities in trouble, and we will have to look to the Commodity Credit Corporation for help. I think it would be very unwise to needlessly hamstring the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Further, this is not an appropriation, it is a limit and they should not spend a dime beyond that which is necessary to carry on the operations of the corporation.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. The point I had in mind, I would like to leave clear in the RECORD. I am addressing myself to this particular phase of the Commodity Credit Corporation operation, but I did develop hastily, and I hope I can develop it more thoroughly during the debate, the sharp decrease in holdings which the gentleman called to the attention of the committee several times. We have now, I think, some 15 items where there is a reduction from some six and a half million pounds from June 30, 1950, to 2,600,000 at the end of March. That is better than a 60-percent reduction. I wonder whether the committee was able to get any information as to the amount of reduction which could reflect itself in terms of elimination of storage costs and of personnel supervising the commodities, and so forth.

Mr. WHITTEN. All I can say in connection with that is that to move out a commodity does not end the work. Frequently the work starts when you move the commodity out as against when you hold it year after year. However, it is just a matter of trying to judge what limitation you should have in view of all the conditions. Within the $15,000,000 they should not spend $10,000,000 unless it is absolutely necessary. But I do not want to say that we have hamstrung them when we are dependent on the farmers to get production.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like to ask the gentleman a question on the very thing he is discussing. We have a program under PMA and Commodity Credit Corporation encouraging the production of certain commodities through the removal of acreage quotas. We also have a situation where on those very commodities the Commodity Credit Corporation has an excess, as far as that particular commodity is concerned, the 1948 and 1949 crops, with the 1950 crop coming into their hands, more or less. In the 1950 crop we have a great quantity of off-grade products, tons of that commodity, which do not qualify under the Commodity Credit Corporation loan, which off-grade commodity is so much off grade that it is now proposed that the farmers destroy that off-grade quantity, but it is certainly in fine physical form for preservation for food. I have had long discussions, as late as this very morning, with the head of the grain division and the Production Marketing Administration, Mr. Kruse and Mr. Hill, and as of 10:30 or 11 o'clock this morning they told me emphatically that they know of no way that that food now on hand in the hands of the farmers can be preserved and protected from absolutely throwing it away, although we are seeking great increases of production of that particular thing.

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly it would be tragic at this time to waste any food. On the other hand, you can see from the questions which have been asked today what kind of problem we would have setting up a Government program to invest Government money in off-grade grains and similar things. But there should be some program worked out to assist those farmers to put that into feed for animals or something of that kind. I think the Department ought to lend its full facilities in trying to work out some program to take care of that. I do not know of anything that can be done here.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman agrees with what I have proposed this very day.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has mentioned the fact that they should not spend all their money if it is not necessary. Does the gentleman know of any agency in the Department of Agriculture, outside of the Commodity Exchange Authority, that does not spend all the money allocated to it?

Mr. WHITTEN. The Farmers' Home Administration will turn back about $800,000. They are carrying quite a number of vacant places on their staff. They found they could get by without them. There are several cases in the Department of Agriculture in which the Bureau of the Budget has withdrawn authority to spend money in connection with control programs. So there are examples. I say, be it to the credit of the Department, since such examples are unusual.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think we should have more of that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

(Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

(Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I beg the indulgence of the Committee in referring to a subject which was taken up here only within the last week or 10 days, but in my view it is of sufficient importance that it ought to be further considered. When the Interior Department appropriation bill was before the House it contained a section providing that with respect to the salary or wage differential paid Federal employees in the Territories and possessions of the United States, that differential payment should no longer be made to persons recruited within the Territories and possessions but should go only to those who are hired within what is termed the continental United States. I very sincerely believe that that section ought to be deleted from the bill now before us as it was deleted from the Interior Department appropriation bill. It is identified as section 407 on page 55 of the present bill. Mr. Chairman, I believe the section is wrong as a matter of principle. I know it would cost the Government more money, not less. I say this because the differential today is based upon the cost of living in these areas outside the 48 States.

If an Alaskan, for example, finds himself after the enactment of this bill receiving 25 percent less pay for doing the same job as someone sitting at the desk next to him, who is recruited from the States, he is going to be obliged to quit that job and seek work elsewhere. He will not be able to live on his salary. What will be the consequence of that? What will happen is that someone will be recruited in the States to take his place. The Government will pay transportation costs for that new employee. There is no way of telling whether he will be satisfied with the living conditions in the particular Territory to which he is sent, whether he will like it there. He may quit and return to the States, and in turn someone else will have to be hired. Very obviously it is going to cost the Government more money.

I had hoped that this differential problem had been settled. In Alaska, of which I can speak with more knowledge, of course, there was a varying practice among the several departments of the Government prior to 1943 relating to the payment of a salary or wage differential. There was no unanimity of opinion whatever as to whether it was being paid with respect to the higher cost of living which might be found or whether it was in effect a recruitment device.

In 1943 the several departments of the Government, under, should I say, the sponsorship of the Civil Service Commission, reached an agreement to pay a differential of 25 percent in recognition of the higher cost of living. In 1948 that was written into law, in a section which appeared in the independent offices appropriation bill of that year, as amended. That law required the payment of the differential to be made under the terms of an Executive order to be promulgated by the President. I think it was in August or September of 1948 that the President issued Executive Order 10,000. Since that time the differential has been paid under the terms of that Executive order, as administered by the Civil Service Commission.

It ought to be emphasized that the differential in Alaska, and I am sure the same statement can be made with reference to Hawaii and Puerto Rico, ever since then has been based upon a higher cost of living in those Territories. Comparison is made between the Territories or the possessions and Washington, D. C. The Civil Service Commission is obligated under the terms of the Executive order to inquire from time to time into the cost of living in a particular area in which the differential is being paid, to see if it is at least 25 percent higher than in the District of Columbia.

The Independent Offices Act referred to prohibits the payment of a differential higher than 25 percent over the Dis-

trict of Columbia. That does not mean to say that a lesser differential cannot be paid. Not only can it be paid, but the Civil Service Commission is required to pay it, if the surveys of living costs reflect a cost of living higher than in the District of Columbia, but not reaching the 25 percent maximum. If the surveys indicate that the living costs are 7 percent higher, then the differential shall be 7 percent, and so on, between no differential at all, and 25 percent.

In reference to Alaska, we have some very recent figures which ought to have a bearing on this whole matter. Last fall a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee went north and subsequently the Department of Labor was asked to make a survey of living costs at Anchorage and Fairbanks, where most of the military work is being carried on at this time. Only last week were the results of that survey released, and that report shows that in February 1951 the cost of living in Anchorage, Alaska, was 40 percent higher than in Seattle, Washington. In Fairbanks it was 47 percent higher than in Seattle. In February 1951 the cost of living in Seattle was somewhat less than in Washington, D. C.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that under the terms of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1948 and the Executive order which followed from that act, every proper safeguard has been set up so that the Government shall not pay a higher differential than is warranted. A splendid illustration was given by the Department of the Interior to me only last week, as to how the enactment of that section of the appropriation bill would have cost the Government more money. In American Samoa and the Trust Territory the administration is being transferred, or has been transferred from the Navy Department to the Department of the Interior. It is intended that many of the employees shall be those who previously were with the Navy. If they are discharged there those people would receive 25 percent less than those recruited from the States. What is going to happen? Naturally they will come over to the United States for discharge and will be released from the Navy in the States and then will be recruited here and go back to American Samoa or the Trust Territory and the Government will be required to pay that tremendous additional cost of transportation.

Even more important, in my judgment far more important, is the fact that the enactment of section 407 in this bill now before us would be a discrimination, no less, against American citizens. It has been the announced policy of our Government to build up our Territories as rapidly as possible and to do everything we can to get people there who will want to stay there. That is especially true in Alaska. The enactment of this provision would militate against that policy and there would be discouragement to those who are citizens of the Territory and at the same time toward American citizens. I have not noted any proposal that those who are residents of a Territory pay less income tax. The proposal has only run the other way.

Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time I hope to offer one or more amendments in respect to this section and I hope one of those amendments will be adopted.

I should like to include with my remarks a very excellent statement on this general situation which was written especially in connection with the Department of the Interior appropriation bill, but which applies in many ways to this bill. This was written by Mr. J. T. Petrich, president of the National Federation of Federal Employees local at Juneau, Alaska:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
FEDERAL EMPLOYEES,
LOCAL NO. 251,
Juneau, Alaska, May 1, 1951.

Hon. ROBERT RAMSPECK,
Chairman, Civil Service Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RAMSPECK: Section 112 of H. R. 3790, Interior Department appropriation bill, which was reported to the House April 20, proposes that the cost-of-living allowance be limited to persons recruited in continental United States, and that it be denied to resident Alaskans.

Juneau Local No. 251, NFFE, strongly protests this proposal for the following reasons:

1. It is grossly unfair to resident Alaskans.
2. It will seriously interfere with efficient operation of all Federal agencies in Alaska.
3. It will increase the cost of operation of Federal agencies in Alaska.
4. It will seriously hamper the defense effort in this critical area.

1. It is grossly unfair to resident Alaskans:

Denial of the cost-of-living allowance to resident Alaskans implies that there is a difference in living habits and living costs between them and employees recruited in the States. This is not true in Alaska. Both groups shop in the same stores, eat the same kinds of food, live under the same housing conditions, buy the same kinds of clothing, and participate in the same types of recreational activities outside the office. There is no discernible difference between the two groups. This is not surprising, since the great majority of Federal employees hired as Alaska residents, came from continental United States and received their education there.

Under the proposal in section 112, two equally competent stenographers could be working at the same grade, living together, and sharing expenses. If one had waited State-side until offered employment in Alaska by a Federal agency, she would have been brought to the Territory at Federal expense and would receive a 25-percent cost-of-living allowance. If the other girl had been an Alaska resident or had paid her own way to Alaska seeking employment, she would not receive the cost-of-living allowance. Such a situation would be manifestly unfair, and would without doubt, impel the latter to seek employment with a firm whose policy was to treat all employees with equal justice.

The cost-of-living allowance is designed to offset the higher cost of living in Alaska in comparison with those in Washington, D. C., up to a 25-percent maximum. All realistic cost-of-living studies made during the last 10 years have demonstrated that the cost of living in southeastern Alaska (the least expensive section) is at least 25 percent above that in Washington, D. C. In more isolated parts of the Territory the difference increases to 40 percent, or above. These conclusions were recognized as valid by the Civil Service Commission when, following the instruction in E. O. 10,000, it established the Alaska cost-of-living allowance at the maximum, 25 percent.

It must also be pointed out that the 25-percent-cost-of-living allowance in Alaska is subject to both Federal and Territorial income taxes, and is consequently reduced to an actual allowance of less than 20 percent.

Obviously, there is no reasonable basis for such discriminatory action.

2. It will seriously interfere with efficient operation of all Federal agencies in Alaska.

A policy such as is contemplated by section 112 will cause a complete breakdown of employee morale and will immeasureably complicate recruiting problems which are already serious.

We shall find employees with equal skill, working side by side at the same grade of position, one receiving 25 percent more income than the other. We shall find supervisors receiving smaller salaries than those working under them. Such situations will prove intolerable and will result in dissatisfied workers and immediate loss to the Federal Government of many experienced and capable employees.

If the cost-of-living allowance is eliminated for employees recruited in Alaska, there will be a general exodus from the Federal agencies of employees affected. The following data from Interior Department agencies in Alaska indicate how widespread and serious such an exodus could be which would apply percentagewise to other Federal agencies in Alaska:

Agency	Total regular employees	Recruited state-side	Recruited Alaska	
				Percent
Office of Indian Affairs	882	330	552	60
Fish and Wildlife Service	154	59	95	62
Alaska Public Works	21	17	4	19
Alaska Road Commission	231	166	65	28
Bureau of Mines				25
Bureau of Reclamation				37

These percentages will rise with the opening of the summer season, during which the programs of most agencies expand sharply and employ large numbers of resident Alaskans. The loss of employees who were recruited in Alaska, plus the inability of the Federal agencies to secure new local employees in competition with other industry, will more than cripple them. In many instances they will simply be unable to function until new employees can be recruited from stateside and trained.

Salaries of Federal employees in Alaska even including the 25 percent cost-of-living allowance, are lower than salaries in private industry. For example, an inexperienced graduate engineer working for a Federal agency can be paid $1.86 per hour (GS–5). If he has worked summers and gained some experience he can be started at $2.30 per hour (GS–7). This same college graduate can work for a contractor on one of the road jobs in the interior Alaska as driver of a pick-up truck and receive a minimum of $2.87 per hour. Drivers of larger trucks receive a minimum of $3.32 per hour. Also, employees for private contractors work many more hours per week than are permitted Federal employees, and at overtime rates, increasing the disparity between the earnings.

Wages for clerical employees under the Alaska merit system are at higher rates than for Federal employees on comparable work.

A GS–4 clerk-stenographer in the Federal service starts at $1.75 per hour including the 25 percent cost-of-living allowance. A

Territorial employee in a comparable position under the merit system starts at $1.88 per hour in southeastern Alaska, and at $2.06 per hour in interior Alaska.

At the present time, many Federal employees are staying on their jobs because they are looking forward to a general increase in salaries, which have lagged far behind the increase in living costs. Should section 112 remain in H. R. 3790, and also be made a part of other appropriation acts, it will mean that such employees will promptly seek other employment where wages are more attractive. Furthermore, should the prohibition against filling more than 25 percent of vacancies be retained in the law, the situation will be hopeless.

3. It will increase the cost of operation of Federal agencies in Alaska.

As pointed out above, eliminating the cost-of-living allowance for resident Alaskans will without question, result in an exodus of resident Alaskans from the Federal service because (a) they realize the utter unfairness of it, and (b) job opportunities outside the Federal service at equal or better pay are plentiful. Such an exodus of resident Alaskans will increase costs as follows:

(a) Recruiting replacements: Replacements will have to be obtained stateside. The Federal Government pays the cost of transporting a new employee and his dependents and their household goods from the point of hire in the States to the job in Alaska. This may cost $2,000 or more for an employee with a family. In addition, each such employee is guaranteed return transportation if he remains on the job for a specified period of 1 to 3 years. These costs are saved when resident Alaskans are hired.

(b) Training: All new employees replacing resident Alaskans will have to be trained. On most jobs it will be from several months to 2 years before they can be as proficient as employees they have replaced.

(c) Turn-over: A high percentage of employees from the States return to the States as soon as their 1- to 3-year contract is fulfilled because they dislike the weather, isolation, hardships, or for some other reason. Many leave even before their contracts are fulfilled. The result will be a higher rate of turn-over which in turn results in additional expense for recruitment and training. Turn-over even under present conditions has been as high as 100 percent per year. Adoption of section 112 will increase it substantially. Federal agencies have therefore recruited locally whenever qualified applicants were available.

4. It will hamper the defense effort in this critical area.

Classified civilian employees are key personnel in many Federal agencies providing services essential for defense. Examples of such essential services include construction and maintenance of key roads and highways, docks, airfields, and other facilities, and fire protection of wild land and military facilities. Action such as contemplated in section 112 will completely disrupt those agencies and severely damage the defense program. It should be borne in mind that the field working season is short, lasting only a few months. It is therefore doubly important that administrative hindrances like the provisions contained in section 112 should not prevail.

In summary, all who are acquainted with the facts as they actually exist clearly recognize the fallacy of a policy that would deprive resident Alaskans of the cost-of-living allowance. From the standpoint of good administration, it is completely indefensible to have two different compensation schedules for competent employees, doing the same work equally well, and living according to the same standards. Furthermore, it is manifestly in the best interests of the Federal Government to continue the cost-of-living allowance in Alaska to all Federal personnel, whether recruited in Alaska or Stateside. In view thereof section 112 should, therefore, be eliminated.

Sincerely yours,

J. T. PETRICH,
President.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN], a member of the committee.

(Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I think practically everyone understands the peculiar position of a member of the Committee on Appropriations. It is the nature of our Government that we have legislative committees to pass on general policy as regards the running of this Nation, and in this case the general policy that involves the operation of the Department of Agriculture. Those policies are turned over to the administration to administer. Our work comes the following year, after a policy has been inaugurated, to review the work of the Department with regard to whether or not the policy as written by Congress and by the legislative committees has been carried out.

My colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] will be the next speaker on the minority side. He is the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture, and I trust you will give him good attention because his talk will be to the point of the welfare of the American farmer.

We have had the pleasure of cooperating with the Committee on Agriculture in the House. They have conferred with us and we with them on many things we find in the bill and in the administration of the Department of Agriculture. I think we have made constructive progress in that.

Several things have come up already that show the need of the House Committee on Agriculture or the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to look into. One of those is the matter of the administration and the various fee charges and usages of our ranges in the United States. I trust that our subcommittee will be assisted with a policy that can be administered in the light of known facts and help to guide us in our future deliberations on the work in the Department of Agriculture.

The matter of wage differentials has come up with regard to our insular possessions and our Territories. Certainly there are many things that should be looked into by the proper committee of the House of Representatives. Of course, you will always run into the fact that legislation that has been passed by this House is going to involve us in many ways, in considering ways and means to hold down expenses. One of the glaring things that the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations and all members of the Committee on Appropriations ran into is the effect on the budget of the United States of the strict application of the 40-hour week. It catapults your appropriations and budgets for the various departments. It is unfortunate that in some categories where it would not be unfair and where it would be truly honest that some exceptions were not made in the application of that law. All of us who study these budgets have run into that. Of course, the wage differentials that affect our Territories and our possessions are affected by climate and by transportation and by many things. I hope that out of the debate today and tomorrow we will have found many reasons for further consideration of constructive, honest legislation which will verify or modify the existing legislation along that line.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. Certainly, I yield.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Can the gentleman tell us how many witnesses the committee heard on the question of payment of wage differentials in the Territories?

Mr. HORAN. I think if you will look at the hearings you will find that that was discussed with the departments which were administering the laws which affect the Territories and insular possessions. I agree with the delegate from Hawaii that this ought to be looked into, but I also want to confirm the attitude and the statement of our subcommittee chairman that he hopes that the committees involved here will pay immediate attention to this and study the facts in the case.

When we report a bill we in effect are reporting to the Congress on how well the policies enacted by various committees have worked out, and to that extent it is a progress report. We are trying to point out some facts that we think ought to be brought to the attention of the Congress.

There is one other item in the bill that has disturbed me, and that is the matter of what might, in many ways, be fairly termed our agricultural intelligence service. We spent a lot of money on intelligence services and practically all of our departments have something that approximates intelligence services. In the Department of Agriculture one of the most important groups is one that I would say is an intelligence service within the Department of Agriculture, and I refer to the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations. They ferret out very essential information from many difficult sources around the world. If you will turn to page 19 of the report you will find that the subcommittee saw fit to include this service among those which were not cut below the budget. We did that because in the language following the title on page 19 you will find that we reviewed the good work of the Foreign Agircultural Service, and on the basis of our studies and the evaluation of their good work we did not make a cut in the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations. Earlier in the report, however, you will find a discussion of the Research and Marketing Act funds. I suppose you are familiar with the Research and Marketing Act funds; they are based upon a bill which was passed some 5 or 6 years ago by this Congress, reported out by the Committee on Agriculture, which were designed to cut down the costs, and the distance, and if possible to improve the quality, the shape, and the form of agri-

cultural products between the farm to the consumer's table. Studies since then have pointed out some glaring things; they have pointed out the cost of transporting agricultural products from the farm to the table. A subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture reported about a year ago that 50 percent of the consumer's dollar was attributable to deductions from that consumers' dollar, in New York City, to charges levied east of the Hudson River; and yet some people blame the farmer for all of the high costs of living. Research in marketing methods and distribution was suggested, and the House passed a bill which provided certain funds for research in these fields.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman has referred to intelligence.

Mr. HORAN. I am going to get to that in just a minute.

Mr. STEFAN. If the membership of the committee will look through the various hearings on appropriations for the various agencies of Government they will find items of expense for intelligence. Most of that, however, is not intelligence, as the public really knows it; I think that is a misnomer. Most of it is a matter of evaluation.

Mr. HORAN. I appreciate that. The men in OFAR evaluate agricultural information from many sources abroad and make it available at home.

Mr. STEFAN. Now, regarding that Hudson River proposition, I recently received a letter with reference to the high cost of living to the consumers in New York. It has been proven beyond the shadow of a doubt that if the farmer gave away every bit of food and received not one cent for it, it would still cost the people of New York 76 to 80 percent of what they have been paying for the things that are brought from the farm.

Mr. HORAN. The biggest part of his food dollar is for things he cannot eat.

Mr. STEFAN. In reference to foreign countries, may I say that I just received a bulletin from ECA, Bulletin No. 2216—I think every member of the gentleman's committee should get a copy of it because it is available to them—which is an announcement by the ECA they are spending $325,000 to buy fertilizer from the Russians to ship to the Philippine Islands for the rehabilitation program in the Philippines. Part of that is the $15,000,000 which ECA took from Europe and transferred over to the Philippines, a very worthy program. But I was amazed that they are going to spend a quarter of a million dollars to buy fertilizer from the Russions in the Russian zone of Germany to ship to the Philippine Islands.

Mr. HORAN. There again the subcommittee on appropriations that handles ECA funds will bring out a bill one of these days which will give all of you Members who have definite opinions on that sort of thing an opportunity to express yourselves and to work the will of the Congress in modifying certain of those things.

When the bill covering research and marketing funds went to the other body, certain modifications were made in it and in its first years of operations the Research and Marketing Act funds became almost a treasury grab bag on the part of the States. I was a member of the subcommittee when we reviewed the work and the allotments so far as research and marketing funds were concerned. We were disturbed and we dug into the matter. We had the Research and Marketing Administrator before us five or six times. We have done an enormous amount of work on that fund since then trying, as we saw it, to make the administration of it be confined to what the Committee on Agriculture especially of the House of Representatives had in mind when the Congress passed the original bill. Why, they had expanded certain of our bureaus in the Department of Agriculture almost twice. People who were under civil service were by this transfer of funds from the grab bag appropriation used to expand operations under the one phrase in the bill that they should make use of existing agencies. This disturbed us and we have called for repeated revisions and modifications of the act. With the Department we have reviewed the language of the act and I want to say that we have made great improvement. I am more satisfied with the act than I was, although I am not completely satisfied yet. We are transferring entirely too many funds from an appropriation made under the guise of research in marketing.

Now to get back to this foreign agricultural service which this committee thinks highly of. In the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations is a group of men who have the respect of all of the industries with whom they come in contact. They are the intelligence service I spoke of; their knowledge and evaluations are much sought after by our domestic producers. They are called commodity specialists. Many of them have lived abroad for years and make periodic trips back home to talk to those producers who are interested to know what is going on in other countries and what the impact of production or lack of production in other countries might be. They provide much intimate knowledge of foreign markets. They are paid for not by the appropriation labeled "Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations," where they should be paid for; they are paid for by a transfer of funds from Research and Marketing Act appropriations. It is not right and it should be corrected.

The committee, in the report, included language which the circumstances of the day appear to indicate to us to be warranted. The very able speech of our subcommittee chairman, I think, outlines the reasons for many of the statements in this bill. He told you, as he began his speech this afternoon—and I think he outlined the work of the Department and our work on the subcommittee very well—that the times had changed since last year. Last year we faced the possibility of a surplus and this year we face the possibility, we face the actual circumstance, of shortages in many particulars. So we felt that in some of these lines of activity, in view of the manpower shortage and the need of dedicating all of our time and all of the Nation's funds directly to the war effort, that we could make certain reductions in certain of these items. The committee did make a reduction in the item from which this commodity specialists service is paid. The committee said ,in the report, that in some fields these Research and Marketing Act expenditures could be reduced by 50 percent. The chairman has already said that he feels that that 50 percent, the exact amount, should not be in the report. But now, what did the Department of Agriculture do? Well, if you serve as I do on the Committee on Appropriations, you will quite often find that when a bureau does not like a cut, they find out who you, John Jones, a member of the Committee on Appopriations, are, and who some people in the bureaus are that you might be friendly with and might believe in.

It so happens I know quite a number of men in the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations. So do other Members of the subcommittee. We believe in their work: Tobacco, cotton, fruits and vegetables and livestock and other fields of work. We believe that they are providing a very, very valuable service to our American producers at a time when this world is pretty topsy-turvy. Some of our areas with a great historic background as exporters of certain commodities are anxious to regain those foreign markets, that because of soft or hard currencies or other problems have been lost. We are fervently hoping that sometime we will be able to regain those markets.

Therefore we want to know from day to day and month to month what the conditions are in these other countries where these men have operated for years. But somebody down in the Department of Agriculture hit upon the reduction which we had indicated in the report and applied it against one of the most valuable bureaus in the whole Department of Agriculture, and they gave the committee report as the excuse for doing it. I want to tell you that the committee report itself refutes the effort to do away with an outstanding phase of the work of the Department of Agriculture's Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations. I have here in my hand a report that was sent to us by courtesy of the Budget Director, who, incidentally, is a very valuable man, and one who has worked very well with this committee and helped us all he could. It was sent to our committee at our request and it outlines who will, specifically, be cut or removed by the arbitrary act of someone in the United States Department of Agriculture.

It is their interpretation. It is the interpretation of somebody down in the Department of Agriculture. Under no circumstances should we allow these commodity specialists to be severed from the Government payroll, especially at this time. Their pay should come from the direct budget item for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations. The Department should look for other and more

appropriate places to make economies in this hour when savings should be had.

I do feel that it is wrong for the Department of Agriculture to hit at a reduction in an essential function when real cuts can be made judiciously and without hurting anyone; certainly it would help the American taxpayer. I should like to see the Department of Agriculture come up here and display some of the cooperation this subcommittee has always made available to them. We five men on this subcommittee represent you down at the Department of Agriculture. We have tried to get along with the Secretary and the members of that Department; but somebody knew what he was doing when he tried to destroy the intelligence service of the American farmer, under the guise that we have asked for it. We did not.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to lend my bit of appreciation to this committee, as I do to all committees who work hard and diligently, especially the Committee on Appropriations. The fact that I may take exception at this time to a specific item in the bill does not lessen my degree of appreciation for the services rendered to all of us.

Mr. Chairman, I rather expect that some of you may be getting just a little bit tired of hearing me talk to you about the spruce-bark-beetle infestation in the national forests of Colorado, Wyoming, and a small segment of eastern Utah. However, in bringing this problem to your attention, I do so more as an adviser to you, my colleagues, than as the Representative of that congressional district which I have the honor to represent. The property in question is a vast forest area which comprises a large segment of the national-forest lands of the United States and represents approximately 8 percent of the total national-forest properties of the Nation. The correct protection of these Federal properties is as much a responsibility of each Member of this honorable body as it is of mine.

Sixty percent of the total area of my district, which in its total size is almost as large as the entire State of New York, is owned by the Federal Government and belongs to all the people of the United States. This area comprises almost 18,000,000 acres of land. It is the combined responsibility of Congress—and by that I mean the responsibility of each individual Member—to see to it that this property is well cared for.

Along with the responsibility of representing the people and the private interests of my district to the best of my ability, I have the added responsibility of calling to the attention of each Member of this body the present condition of federally owned property situate within my district. I consider that when I have advised the Members of Congress to the best of my ability, then my responsibility for the care of such federally owned property of the United States is of the same degree as that of each and every one of you, my colleagues.

I was born in the East, in the great State of Ohio. To be more specific, I was born within the boundaries of that congressional district so ably represented by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable CLARENCE BROWN. I think that I can understand the attitude of some Members of Congress as to these federally owned properties which many of them have never had the pleasure of seeing. However, I can assure each and every one of you that these federally owned properties are valuable and that at some time in the not too distant future greater attention will be paid to these values by the Nation than has been paid in the past—and most certainly more attention than is being paid at present.

My forebears came to this great country of ours in the early days of its history. They have successively and successfully pioneered in Virginia, Pennsylvania, New York, and Ohio before moving to the far West. All too often they have seen the natural resources wasted or destroyed because of the greed or lack of interest on the part of the people developing the areas in which they lived. I would not be true to my obligation to each one of you if I did not bring home to you as forcefully as I can the situation which exists in a large area of the national forests in my district.

A good husbandman cares for his property. He protects it at all times with the sole purpose in mind of having the ultimate amount of usage from the particular property concerned. One does not wait idly by for the barn to burn down if he sees the first spark of fire which starts the conflagration. Neither does one wait for the ravages of an epidemic to wear itself out by natural processes if there is anything he can do to stem its tide.

The national forest lands in my district consists of approximately 9,500,000 acres, of which 3,700,000 acres is comprised of commercial timber equaling at this time in the neighborhood of 16,000,000,000 board feet of salable lumber of the undetermined value, at today's estimates, of something near $100,000,000. Of this amount there are approximately 8,000,000,000 board feet of Englemann spruce and 4,800,000,000 board feet of lodgepole pine—both of which varieties of timber are valuable primarily for wood pulp but also to a limited extent for mining and construction usages.

In the late 1930's western Colorado was visited by winds far beyond the normal velocities usually found in that part of the Nation. Many of our forests suffered heavily, especially the White River Forest located in the northwestern part of the State. A few years after the winds which damaged and felled large amounts of timber, it was noticed that there was more than the normal population of an insect called the spruce bark beetle. Normally the population of this pest is kept under control by varying low winter temperatures or by the woodpecker population living in these particular areas. However, normal conditions did not exist after this heavy destruction to the timber and the beetle has increased in population far beyond normal conditions or for that matter beyond what was expected by Forest Service officials.

The migration of the beetles following their increased numbers was northeastward through the White River National Forest. It was thought that the wind currents which carried the migrating beetles would continue in their usual movements and that the damage would be contained in 2 of Colorado's 12 national forests, with some damage likely in southern Wyoming. However, after the White River National Forest was almost completely destroyed and the damage to the Routt National Forest was most severe, then the migrations of the beetles changed and they continued not only northeasterly but also eastward, southeastward, and southward into new areas.

Until sometime in 1949 there was no known practical way of killing this particular beetle. However, in that year research scientists within the Agriculture Department discovered a combination of orthodichloro benzene and fuel oil which was feasible of application and destructive of the beetle.

Accordingly, a year ago the Forest Service came before Congress and asked for an appropriation to start the campaign to contain or control the beetle infestation within these nationally owned forests. Because of the shortness of time permitted for planning, the program proposed was not too well considered and it was suggested that more than likely a 2-year campaign treating a little over one-half million trees last year and a litle larger amount this year might stop the infestation. Two millions of dollars were appropriated by a Congress alive to its responsibilities. During the summer and fall of 1950 almost 800,000 trees were sprayed, at an average cost of $2.26 per tree, which cost was just a little bit more than one-half of what the Forest Service advised would be the cost per tree. However, after a more inclusive survey made in 1950 by the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine it has been found that the infestation is greater than first thought and that it will take from 4 to 6 years to contain or control the infestation with a total estimated expenditure in the neighborhood of $12,000,000 to $13,000,000, rather than the original $6,000,000 first proposed. Here again I wish to be absolutely honest with you, my colleagues, and advise you that there is no absolute certainty that the proposed program will be absolutely successful. However, in other areas of our national forests similar campaigns proposed by the Forest Service have been carried out at approximately the cost suggested during the first 2 years of the projects. I am advised that all of these programs have resulted in ultimate successes far beyond expectations.

The committee report on the bill now under discussion carries no reference to the request of the Forest Service for the $3,400,000 which was originally included

within the budget estimate. The reason for lack of reference in this report is that the committee in its report on the last deficiency appropriation bill brought before this body made the following statement relative to a request for a supplemental appropriation for this project:

> The committee does not feel that additional appropriations for control of Englemann spruce bark beetle are justified in view of the present admission of the high cost of the program, particularly in relation to the value of the timber involved, and because it is doubtful that the project can ever be successfully completed. It is of the opinion that no further work should be done on this project.

In other words, the committee by its statement endeavored to foreclose any further consideration of this program. This was done even though $2,000,000 of Federal moneys have already been invested in this enterprise.

Some of you may ask the question, Why is not the spraying done from the air rather than having the necessity of applying the mixture directly to the bark on the trunk of the tree? In answer, I wish to advise that spraying from the air is effective only where the insects feed on the leaves or outer surfaces of the branches which can be reached by an insecticide distributed from the air. These spruce bark beetles spend their life in the tree and do their feeding underneath the bark and it is impossible to reach them by aerial spraying. The insecticide must be applied in sufficient volume directly to the bark, underneath which the beetles are found, in order that it may penetrate to a sufficient depth to kill them. This bark treatment is the method currently in use for practically all bark-beetle projects.

It has been publicized recently that last winter's cold weather in Colorado killed a great part of the beetle population. While it is true that the Black Hills or pine bark beetles in the Ponderosa pine areas on the east slope of the mountains in Colorado were largely killed by the cold, yet this is not true in the western part of Colorado where we have the infestation of the spruce beetle. Almost all of the beetles alive in the tree at the beginning of winter journey to the lower part of the tree and hibernate either at the ground level or immediately above the ground level. They do this, of course, to get the protection that the coverage of snow affords during the cold weather. The usual depth of snow in the areas concerned is between 5 and 8 feet during the coldest part of the winter period. Only a very small percentage of the beetles residing in the bark, which was covered by snow, have been killed by cold temperatures according to latest advice from the Forest Service. However, with the beetles having gone to the base of the trees for protection from the cold, if it is possible to move into the affected areas immediately following the melting of the snows and before the coming of warm weather with its attendant migration of the winged beetles to other areas, it will be that much easier to spray the trees this year than last. In other words, there should be less area per tree to spray.

Questions have been raised as to the value of the timber in question and it has been pointed out that the receipts of all timbers sold from the Colorado national forests does not yet amount to a million dollars. I believe that this is true. On the other hand, there is a greatly expanded market at the present time for this kind of timber and there is presently being sent to Wisconsin alone in the neighborhood of 50,000 cords per annum. It would appear from present indications that the construction of a paper pulp mill in western Colorado in the very near future will be a certainty. Because of the present scarcity of wood pulp and because of the particular adaptability of wood pulp produced from spruce timbers for defense purposes, the construction of such a mill will be made a defense project and will not only bring additional moneys to the Treasury of the United States but also will help in the over-all defense effort. If the prices bid last year by the company interested in the proposed mill are allowed to stand and the project is carried on for a minimum of 20 years, there will be returned to the United States Treasury from this project alone approximately 16 millions of dollars, which is several million dollars more than the ultimate cost of this whole control project. At the same time the containment or control of the beetle infestation in the forests concerned will provide for the future sales of usable timber for the years to come, and will also protect vast watersheds, extensive grazing areas and unlimited recreational resources.

Also the question of State participation has been brought into the picture. Here again permit me to say—these are federally owned lands and the State jurisdiction over the same is limited to certain police-control responsibilities. As I understand it, we have never expected the States to put up any money to protect the national forest timber resources from insects, disease, fire, or any other destructive agents. On the contrary, under section 2 of the Clarke-McNary Act of 1924 the Government is spending something over nine millions of dollars a year in cooperation with the States in the protection of State forests as well as privately owned forest lands. The proposal for State contribution for this project would be a complete reversal of existing policy and practice.

Some one may say that after all the protection of the watershed should be of some value to the State of Colorado. Here again I wish to call to your attention the fact that between 70 and 80 percent of the water arising in the Colorado River Basin watershed comes from my district; and, that stands of Englemann spruce cover 2 percent of that particular watershed area. It should be noted here that 20 percent of the 80 percent of Colorado's contribution to the Colorado River watershed comes from the Englemann spruce populated areas. Most of these waters are allowed to flow down the Colorado River and are used by lower basin States. Sedimentation recently carried by the Colorado River is filling up Lake Meade all too rapidly. With the destruction of the Englemann spruce forests of the upper Colorado River watershed and with the consequent more rapid melting of snows more erosion will be the result. This can only mean more sedimentation carried by rushing waters during the spring runoff which will mean an increased amount of silt flowing into the great reservoir at Hoover Dam which also is an investment of the people of the United States.

Certain Colorado counties, in which the proceeds of certain sales of timber and grazing facilities are received, profit to a limited extent. However, the entire benefits to the counties of my district from such proceeds, which go to schools and roads, amount to about $161,900, and for counties of the whole State to about $217,000. In the event of forest fires, the likelihood of which is enhanced, of course, by dead timber still standing or fallen, it is up to the local communities to make up the greater part of the fighting force to combat such fires. The value to the Federal Government alone in having a reservoir of people ready and willing to step in and protect these resources belonging to the Federal Government more than compensates for any dollar values that may flow especially to the residents of Colorado.

Then there are other values which must be considered, particularly those in reference to recreational advantages. It is estimated that in 1950 more than one-half million people visited the national forest areas of western Colorado. These visits were made for the purpose of finding rest, recreation, fishing, hunting, and so forth, in these great vastnesses of our Nation. By far the greater number of these people were from States other than Colorado.

Also my district holds unlimited mineral resources still to be developed, not only for the economy of Colorado but for the welfare of the entire Nation. Many of these mineral resources are located in close proximity to standing spruce timber. In the development of such mining properties spruce timber is used extensively. The nearness of such timber sometimes determines the feasibility of carrying on the mine operation. With a loss of this valued resource, an additional handicap would be placed upon the mining industry of Colorado.

Once again, Mr. Chairman, I wish to call to your attention the size of the area involved. It is approximately one-fourth of the total area of the district I represent. The area of the timberland already destroyed is approximately the size of the State of Rhode Island. The area of the land on which the standing timber may ultimately be destroyed is twice the size of the State of Delaware. These resources belong to the people of the United States. These resources are involved directly with the economic welfare of the whole Nation. The saving of such resources, if possible, is most worthwhile. The writing off of them without further consideration is, in my opinion, the most ill considered of any possible course of action. I ask simply that each one of you resolve in your own mind the values here considered and then make your decision just as if it were property

of your own on some tract of land owned by you individually; or a piece of stock owned by you and now reposing safely in the bank deposit vault; or a part, even though minor, of other investments which you may possess. If these timber resources are permitted to be destroyed, from three to four generations will suffer before they can be replaced. It is not our property alone that is involved. It is that of our posterity as well.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Does not the gentleman agree that it is just as important to complete this project in Colorado to save this great natural resource as it is to complete some of the dams in the West for the development and protection of other resources?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is absolutely correct; there is no doubt about it. This is property which belongs to the people of the Nation and it should be protected.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I wish to refer to the national forests of which the gentleman speaks. It happens that in the State of West Virginia we have two national forests. A certain percentage of the proceeds from the sale of timber from those forests goes to the local school and road districts, the remaining 75 percent goes into the Treasury. West Virginia last year paid into the Treasury better than nearly a million dollars in net earnings for the Government. What is the situation in the gentleman's State?

Mr. ASPINALL. I may say that up to the present time perhaps the sale of timber alone would not support the care that has been given to our lands, but the grazing fees would help in this respect.

Mr. BAILEY. If that timber is adequately protected, in a matter of a few years it will be more than paying its way.

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes. The figure I gave, the expenditure of $13,000,000 which is considered necessary to stop this infestation, means not only the collection of some $20,000,000 within the next 20 years from the sale of woodpulp timber alone but it also means the sale of other timber as well and other assets of these forests belonging to the Government.

Mr. BAILEY. It appears to me it is a long-range program that is not going to cost the Government anything if we can make those paying propositions. That is the objective?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is the objective. It simply means an investment of money of the United States in property belonging to the United States in order to protect the investment which we have there. That is all there is to it.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STIGLER].

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Chairman, after extensive hearings the House Appropriation Subcommittee for the Department of Agriculture with the approval of the full Committee on House Appropriations brings this bill for the next fiscal year to the floor. The hearings were not as extensive as they were last year because of our being in a national emergency. Notwithstanding this, there were some agencies which asked for increased funds, but in most instances their requests were denied.

The product of our efforts is not all one would desire if we were living in normal times, but in view of the international situation, our committee reduced appropriations wherever we thought possible and attempted to put first things first. In view of the many obstacles we had to face, I consider the measure as one where the pattern was cut to the cloth instead of vice versa.

I cannot let this opportunity go by without paying tribute to the other members of our subcommittee. Working on this great committee with the distinguished gentlemen who compose it has been a source of great satisfaction to me. Our chairman, the Honorable JAMIE WHITTEN, of Mississippi, again demonstrated the qualifications of leadership which a chairman should have. He was at all times fair but critical when the occasion demanded.

A new Democratic member came to our committee this year, who is deeply interested in agriculture and has a broad viewpoint as to the important part agriculture plays in our national economy. He is Mr. JOE BATES, of Kentucky. He made many suggestions which were timely and wholesome. The other two members of our committee consist of Messrs. H. CARL ANDERSEN, of Minnesota, and HORAN, of Washington. Both are Republicans but in our discussions, deliberations, and conclusions there was at no time any partisanship displayed. As long as the problems of agriculture are approached from such a high level, the farmers of our Nation need have no fear as to their future. It was a genuine pleasure to work with all of these gentlemen.

No report would be complete without praising our executive clerk, Mr. Ross Pope. In our efforts to write a fair and equitable bill, I found him a tower of strength and most helpful.

The following summary sets forth the committee action with respect to the amounts in the bill:

Summary of the bill

Item	Appropriations, 1951 (as reduced under sec. 1214)	Estimates, 1952	Recommended in bill for 1952	Bill compared with—	
				1951 as reduced under sec. 1214	1952 estimates
Direct annual appropriations:					
Title I—Regular activities	$772,500,700	$786,605,546	$719,707,433	−$52,793,267	−$66,898,113
Title II—Special activities	399,000	33,400,000	450,000	51,000	−32,950,000
Total direct annual appropriations	772,899,700	820,005,546	720,157,433	−52,742,267	−99,848,113
Loan authorizations	444,500,000	262,000,000	261,250,000	−193,250,000	−10,750,000
Administrative expense limitations	20,484,000	24,154,000	18,954,000	−1,530,000	−5,200,000

I would like to call special attention to the comparison of appropriations during World War II and what they are now.

In our report we said:

The appropriations for the Department for each of the 3 years preceding the last war were in excess of $1,000,000,000. The amount provided in 1941 was $1,543,000,000, more than twice the amount of $720,157,433 recommended in the 1952 bill. During this same period, the Department has reduced its personnel by nearly 40,000 from 108,000 in 1941 to less than 70,000 in 1951.

We said further:

This comparison has particular significance when it is realized that the 1952 funds cover many new activities such as the school-lunch program, the rural-telephone program, the farm-housing program, and the Research and Marketing Act, which were not in existence in 1941.

I would like to point out that never before in the history of our existence has the productive ability of American agriculture assumed the importance it has during recent months.

The American farmer has been called upon to expand his production which involves increases in 1951 over 1950 of 10,000,000 acres of cotton—54 percent increase—5,600,000 acres of corn, 3,000,000 acres of wheat, and 300,000 acres of rice, Judging the future by the past, I feel sure that the American farmer will respond to the demands made upon him, but we should not expect him to do it alone.

The farmer does not receive the same treatment as other segments of our economy. Congress has passed legislation permitting defense production funds to be loaned to industry to establish plants, and provision is being made for them to amortize completely the cost of these facilities in a short period of time. However, no provision is made to compensate the farmer for depreciation on his farm and for loss in fertility of his soil. Expansion in industry is being underwritten to a large extent by firm defense contracts of the Federal Government. Yet, the only guaranty being offered the farmer is the percentage of parity—which is not a guaranty of profit. As a matter of fact, parity does not even take cost of production into consideration.

Since the beginning of time, man has required food and clothing for survival. People can live without any of the other luxuries and so-called necessities, but without food for subsistence and fiber for protection from the elements, people perish. This is an elementary principle but one which too many of our people are inclined to forget when they think about our farm economy.

Mr. Chairman, it seems that every time there is any change in economic conditions, whether the change be for the better or worse makes no difference, some of our metropolitan newspapers launch an attack on the American farmers. If there is a slump, they loudly

proclaim that the farmer is getting too much for his products. If there is inflation, they shout that the farmer is the cause of it.

In times of food shortages, they say that it is the farmer's fault because he is not producing enough. If a surplus of farm products develops, they cry even louder.

As I said, some of our large city newspapers this year have carried a variety of comment regarding agricultural subjects ranging from the soil conservation program to the high retail price for meat—and it is always the farmer who gets the blame.

One newspaper made much of the budget items for the Commodity Credit Corporation. Reference was made constantly to the so-called losses, but I saw no mention made of any of the profits or returns of money to the Treasury by the Corporation. For example, they had plenty to say about a reported loss of some $91,600,000 on buying up and disposing of fourteen food commodities in the first 5 months of the current fiscal year—but I have seen no mention in any newspaper of the disposal of $1,720,000,000 worth of commodities by the Corporation from July 1, 1950, through November 30, 1950. Over $142,000,000 worth of these commodities were sold to Government agencies and relief agencies for export. Over $892,000,000 worth of these commodities were sold to commercial exporters and into domestic channels. Over $37,000,000 worth was donated to schools, institutions, foreign relief agencies and to American Indians.

From 1933 through November 30, 1950, according to the information given me, the Commodity Credit Corporation sustained a net realized loss of $763,000,000 on all of its price support operations, or approximately 5 cents per dollar invested in loans and purchases of commodities. If the loss on potato operations of $428,000,000 is eliminated—and the American farmer certainly cannot honestly and fairly be charged with this fiasco—then the net cost of price support operations per dollar invested is reduced to 2.3 cents.

Mark well that figure—the net cost of price support operations has been less than 2½ percent. Is not this a very small price to pay for the stabilization of our basic economy—our agricultural economy? It is axiomatic that the rest of the Nation lives off the farmer. In America, about 20 percent of our people are engaged in farming—the lowest ratio for any Nation in the world which does not depend upon imports of foodstuffs and fiber for clothing.

And what does all this mean to the four out of five of our people who work in the factories and offices and live in the cities? Simply this—that they are dependent upon the farmer not only as a producer of food and fiber for clothing, but as a consumer of the goods and services they manufacture, distribute, and sell.

The approximately $2 per person that the price-support program has cost since 1933 has meant much to our economy. A recent survey by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics indicated that the income of American farmers would have been reduced by $5,250,000,000 if there had been no price support for the 1948 and 1949 crops of cotton, corn, and wheat. What a blow that would have been to the nonfarmers who manufacture, distribute, and sell goods and services to our farmers.

I remember reading one editorial in February of this year where one of the Washington newspapers came forth with an editorial proposal that the soil-conservation program be discontinued and the farmers "turned out into the cold world." By so doing, says this editorial:

> It would save $285,000,000 annually, enough to buy about 600 medium tanks.

I am wondering if they have not been so blinded by their own prejudices as to think that the tanks are more essential to our survival than the very soil from which we gain our sustenance?

I wonder if the men and women who write these editorials have any comprehension or understanding of the value of our soil-conservation program. I wonder if they realize that despite our most valiant efforts, millions of tons of precious topsoil are blowing and washing away from our farms. I wonder if they know what that means to them in terms of steaks and bread and milk and potatoes. I cannot bring myself to the thought that they do—else they would not pen such words.

History records that once great and fertile fields are now arid wastelands because the soil was not conserved. Portions of the Nile Valley in Egypt, which once fed millions of people are now worthless deserts and generations that once thrived on their bounty are now without issue. Bands and tribes—even whole races—of people have disappeared because their soil became so depleted as to deny efforts to produce the food and fiber of life.

The plain and simple truth, Mr. Chairman, is that we need more—not less—soil conservation. Our population, like that of other Nations, is increasing at a rapid rate. Census officials estimate that we have grown by something like one and one-half million souls since the count was made just last year. It is very likely that within 50 years we will have to produce enough to feed and clothe 200,000,000 American citizens within our borders.

And who has the greatest stake in the productivity of America's farms? The men, women, and children who live in the cities throughout the land. For that reason alone, if for no other, every urban dweller in the land should lend active support to the agricultural program of this Nation which is designed to produce more and more foodstuffs and fiber at less and less cost, effort, and acreage. The abundant life we seek to perpetuate and expand is more dependent upon agriculture than any other factor in our economy.

We would all do well to keep in mind the admonition of the great American orator who said:

> Level our cities and they will spring up again; destroy our farms and grass will grow in the main streets of America.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize this thought, to those who are opposed to parity or equality of opportunity for the American farmers. In this troubled world today with the lone exception of the United States, the countries whose economies are largely agricultural are all well ahead of those whose economies are mainly industrial. Who, then, can with conscience oppose a program designed to foster and promote the agricultural enterprise in the United States?

In February of this year, the Secretary of Agriculture released a statement about our farm economy. I was greatly impressed with the statement and it is my hope that many who might not have read it before will take the time to acquaint themselves with this most important subject. I commend it to all and particularly to those who would do harm to the future welfare and security of our people by their attacks on the farm program and the American farmer.

(Mr. STIGLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, the United States of America is about to lose valuable property because Congress does not act. This property cannot be replaced. Unless immediate steps are taken to preserve this property the United States will suffer irreparable losses.

Along the Continental Divide from Wyoming to New Mexico and parts of Utah is a great forest. The United States Government owns this forest. This forest has been infected with the Emgelmann spruce beetle. This deadly insect is rapidly destroying the forest. This destruction has many disastrous results.

Unless this Congress takes immediate steps to wipe out the beetle killer of timber we will have dead forests. Forest fires will start easily and the timber will be destroyed. The watersheds of the area will not have protection that nature provided. The water flow will no longer be regulated, with the result that there will be increased flood hazards, and recreational value of the forest destroyed.

This Nation, therefore, will suffer for shortage of pulpwood, the manufacture of paper containers, and other needed items. This industry will no longer flourish.

We in the United States have learned to preserve our natural resources. Why should we, at this time, abandon this policy? The failure to appropriate sufficient funds to carry out this program is a departure from the accepted policies of the past.

Therefore, I urge you that immediate steps be taken to preserve this property and prohibit its destruction.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time so that my reply to the argument just advanced may appear at the same place in the RECORD. If we could run the House of Representatives on the basis of accommodations to our friends, certainly this

item of the bark beetle or the spruce beetle in Colorado would be in this bill. Many other things would be in this bill if we could run it that way. But, in order that the record may be straight, the situation in regard to the spruce-bark beetle in Colorado is this: The Forestry Department last year requested an appropriation of $2,800,000 to get rid of the spruce-bark beetle in an area in Colorado that is equal to the size of several of your New England States. Each tree has to have special treatment from top to bottom. You have to go into those areas and treat all of those trees. They estimated that you would have to treat 725,000 trees to do the job. There were many questions involved that did not seem to hold water with me and I opposed it and kept it out, but it was put in in the other body. This was handled, incidentally, by the deficiency subcommittee. Two million dollars was included in this deficiency bill of last year. Instead of treating 725,000 trees, which they said would do the job, they treated 850,000. This year they come back to the views substantially I had last year and now they say instead of taking $2,000,000 and treating 850,000 trees, it will take $13,000,000 and we have got to treat 67,000,000 trees. They said last year, "Why, this timber is worth about thirty or forty million dollars." Now they say it is worth $90,000,000. Do you know that the record in Colorado shows that for 10 years they have only sold $700,000 worth of spruce timber? Now, it is true that we have said that if you want to do this work out there that we think you ought to work it out on a cooperative basis. Maybe it is a little hard to work out the details, but if you had a cooperative basis, as we have advocated it, it would give us a yardstick to determine the value of many things on which it is hard for us to estimate the value. If the local people would put up their fair share of the money, it would give us a pretty good basis for determination.

As for the spruce bud beetle in Washington and Oregon, the local people do put up half of the cost. In those circumstances, however, the timber has proven value; it is bringing in money. The treatment can be done by airplanes. It is in the buds of the spruce where you can reach it by spray. But, as to the Colorado situation, as I see it, the only sound basis in the world that we can do it on would be as an accommodation to our two good friends from that State. In the other body sometimes they add money for that purpose, figuring the House of Representatives would take it out, but we never have operated on that basis, and as much as we think of them, we just cannot see that there is any basis for appropriating this sum here.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Does the gentleman know of any instance where the State has contributed to the building up of Federal property?

Mr. WHITTEN. In Washington and Oregon, in the present spruce bud-worm areas, the local people of the State are contributing approximately 50 percent of the cost.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Well, it is inconsistent, as far as Government property is concerned, that the people ought to build that property up.

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, I do not know that there is any obligation on the part of the State to build up Federal property. On the other hand, if the Federal Government wants to let Federal property go down, for the State to insist that the Federal Government should spend $13,000,000 would indicate that the State had an interest in it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Does not the gentleman think that the Federal Government has an interest in the maintenance of the watershed?

Mr. WHITTEN. It does, and we should exercise reasonable care and make reasonable effort to try to protect it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Does not the gentleman realize that if these trees are not protected, that it will kill them, and result in forest fires?

Mr. WHITTEN. Does the gentleman know how long you have had that pest out there?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. No; I do not know.

Mr. WHITTEN. You will find that it has existed for quite a long time, and that last year the forestry department thought there were only 725,000 trees that needed treatement. Be that as it may, under present conditions, I cannot see the soundness of this program of spending $13,000,000 to protect this area when only a little over $700,000 has been received for all spruce timber for 10 years.

Questions have been raised about another matter in this bill which has to do with this 25-percent differential. I think perhaps this answer should be made.

I was instrumental in putting this provision in the bill, because I learned the Department in several instances was requiring agencies of the Department of Agriculture to pay resident citizens of the Territories 25 percent more than resident citizens of the United States get for the same work. In other words, in Alaska, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico, or Guam, or many of these other places, native citizens are entitled to equal treatment with the citizens of the United States—do not misunderstand me about that—but the Department requires various agencies to pay to the man who lives there and does the same work the fellow in the same job here does, be it in the post office, be it as an assistant farm agent—in those areas, though he was a native citizen already there, he got 25 percent more than the man in the United States got for doing the same job. In my estimation, you cannot justify that. Equal treatment, yes. Special treatment, no. I put it in this bill because I wanted to make a protest against such a practice.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentlemen from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Was it not the purpose of that provision in the basic law to encourage experts from the mainland to go to the Territories to render a service which could not be rendered by the people who lived in the Territories?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is my understanding of it. Of course, the provision of the bill does not prohibit what the gentleman mentions there. If you have to send someone out, there is no protest made about it, because of the travel and the expense incident to having to go to another country. But here it just says, "Pay the resident citizens of those areas like you pay the resident citizens of the United States for the same work." We think the provisions of the bill were sound.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I desire to address the committee at greater length on this subject and shall do so at a later time, but may I ask the gentleman if in the course of the committee's inquiry it determined the origin of this policy, and also the proportion of Federal employees in the Territory of Hawaii that are in the employ of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am going to say this, that while this is a bill that my subcommittee happens to have charge of, this is not a case of picking out agriculture. We contemplate bringing in a bill of general application. Doubtless this provision will have consideration when we get to writing the bill of general application. Certainly they should be treated alike across the board.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Does not the gentleman feel it would be extremely unfair to the employees of the Department of Agriculture, who number less than 200, to be dealt with on this basis, whereas there are something like 24,000 that are dealt with on the other basis?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am just assuring the gentleman that this provision will be in the bill of general application which will follow.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kansan [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, at the very beginning of what I have to say I desire to express my appreciation of the fine work this subcommittee has done on the agricultural appropriation bill. We have come to expect a good job on this bill under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the other able members of his committee. While there may be items in the bill with which I am not in entire accord, I am happy to say that I think the committee has done a splendid job.

I want to talk for a little while about a matter which is of vital concern to agriculture and is as well of interest and concern to every man, woman, and child in this country.

I refer to the order recently issued by the OPS putting a ceiling price on beef cattle and beef. This order, while it might, in the beginning, more directly

affect the producers of beef cattle, will in the end seriously affect every consumer of beef in this country. It will result in less beef being available for consumption. It will result in a maldistribution of whatever beef is available and finally, if continued for any length of time, will inevitably bring about meat rationing. In other words, if this order is continued we are going to go through exactly the same process we went through during World War II in connection with the distribution of beef and other meats and those experiences, as everyone knows, were very unhappy ones.

Initially the fault with this order is that it puts a roll-back into effect.

It may be difficult to enforce price ceilings, where you freeze the price at an existing level, but everyone will acknowledge that it is much more difficult to carry out a price-ceiling order which involves a roll-back. Furthermore, such an order cannot be carried out without doing a tremendous injustice to everyone who is carrying an inventory.

In the case of beef cattle, the price of which is admittedly high, there has been authority to impose price ceilings ever since last September. The price of beef cattle in September was approximately the same as it was during the May-June period. A ceiling could have been put on at that time which would have maintained those prices. No roll-back would have been necessary. Producers, in my opinion, would not have complained. A ceiling on beef cattle imposed any time before the middle of November would have frozen prices at a pre-Korean level.

The roll-back order now about to go into effect provides that on the 20th of May there shall be a price ceiling put into effect which is approximately 10 percent on an average below the present prices. The order goes down to the wholesale and retail levels. It will not for the present, and perhaps never, result in a single cent of reduction in the price that the housewife pays. Everything included in this 10-percent roll-back which was put into effect initially is going to be absorbed by the distributors of meat.

The order further provides that on the first day of August there will be a further rollback of 4½ percent, and on the first day of October a further 4½ percent rollback. It is of course the hope of the Administrator of the OPS that these last rollbacks will be reflected to the housewives in their purchases of meat. No one knows whether this will or will not be true. In the very beginning I think we ought to understand what it is that has brought about the high price of beef. We talk about meat prices being high, but the fact is that outside of beef and lamb—and lamb is a special product consumed by comparatively few people—the price of meat is not high. Hog prices are not even up to parity. The price of poultry is not high. The price of eggs is not high. Neither are up to parity. The people of this country who think that beef prices are too high can secure in poultry and eggs a high quality protein food equivalent to beef, as far as food value goes, although perhaps not so acceptable as far as taste and flavor are concerned. Pound for pound they can obtain eggs for about one-third the cost they are paying for beefsteak. If they want pork they can get it for about half the cost they are paying for beefsteak. So that the price of meat, poultry, and eggs—with the exception of beef and lamb—is not high. Beef is high because there is a tremendous demand, especially for the better cuts. It is simply a case where the beef producers of this country, although they have increased production, have not been able to produce as much as the people of this country demand and want to consume. The only way to bring down prices is more production.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I will yield later if I have time. I want to develop this point first, if you please.

In the case of other scarce commodities, in order to induce increased production, we are letting prices do the job. We are not rolling back the price of scarce materials or minerals. We are letting the price go up. The price of those things has gone up tremendously since the beginning of the war and increased prices have brought increased supplies. We need to expand our labor force, but we are not trying to get expansion by rolling back wages. We are letting wages go up. Yet in the case of beef it seems to be the idea that you can get more beef by lowering the price that the producer receives for his product.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. The price of rubber, because of international bungling, a part of it the responsibility of our own administration, has risen from around 25 or 30 cents up to as high as 80 cents a pound in the last year or 18 months.

Mr. HOPE. Yes. Of course, that is an illustration where scarce materials have risen greatly in price and we are not trying to meet that situation by rolling back the price and telling the people who are producing it that they are going to have to take less for it.

This roll-back order, in my opinion, and in the opinion of everyone I have talked to who knows anything about the livestock business, will result in less livestock going to market. It means less meat, it means maldistribution of the meat we have and in the end it means rationing in order to distribute the decreased amount fairly.

Let me call attention to some of the provisions of the order itself, because they make it certain that the price received by the producer will be reduced even more than the schedule in the order itself.

Under this order meat is divided into different grades, and the price is fixed which the packer can receive for each grade. The price that he pays to the producer is based upon the grades which have been fixed under the order, such as prime choice, good commercial, utility, and cutters and canners. The price differential between "utility" and "commercial" is $5.50 per 100 pounds. That beef has to be graded by someone who goes into the packing house, looks at a carcass and decides whether it is utility or commercial. I am told by those who know that it is a very difficult matter for even an experienced grader to make a choice between commercial and good, or between utility and commercial; and yet if a grader goes into a packing house and looks at a long row of carcasses and decides that this one is utility rather than commercial, it means $5.50 difference per 100 pounds in the price. That would be bad enough if we had experienced graders, but in order to procure men to grade this meat, they have had to go out and hire about 600 new inexperienced graders, and it will be they who decide whether the carcass and the animal which it represents belongs in one grade or another.

You can imagine the effect this will have on the packer buyers, because if they guess wrong when they buy an animal, it means that the packer is going to lose $55 on a 1000-pound animal, and we can all guess what the reaction of that packer buyer is going to be; instead of taking a chance by buying it as commercial, he is going to call it utility. So, in addition to the low ceiling price that has been placed on the product under this rollback order, the farmer is going to be confronted with the fact that his animal is likely to be downgraded in order that the packer may be sure that some incompetent grader in a packing plant does not make a mistake and grade a good carcass as commercial or a commercial carcass as utility.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Is there a difference of 5½ cents a pound between "Commercial" and "Utility"?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; and the differential between Commercial and Good is $4.20 per hundred.

Another thing about the order to which I want to bring your attention is that under the order each slaughterer is given a quota. If the packer does not keep within the price range in purchasing his livestock he loses his slaughter quota; in other words, he goes out of business. The slaughter quota which has been given packers for the first month that this order is in operation is 90 percent of what it was a year ago. There are more cattle in the country than there were a year ago, yet the slaughterers are given a quota of only 90 percent of what they had last year. I do not know whether that is a confession on the part of those who are administering the law that it is going to reduce the quantity of beef going onto the market or not. It does mean that the amount of beef that can be slaughtered in this country under the first month of operation will be 90 percent of what was slaughtered during a similar period last

year. In other words, for the first month we are going to have that much less beef.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That will produce a scarcity of meat?

Mr. HOPE. It will.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am of the opinion that those who perceived this plan have an idea that this 90 percent quota will hold back animals and prevent them rushing into the market in fear of market competition or reduction. Of course, that is a fallacy if that is their theory. May I ask the gentleman, Does this plan of setting the price not throw into the whole scheme a conglomeration of market hazards and price hazards by reason of this process that the producer of beef does not face at the present time or under an open price?

Mr. HOPE. That is true. The beef producer always faces plenty of hazards. He is prepared to meet those hazards, but this imposes additional hazards that he does not have to meet naturally, and, to that extent it will discourage production.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And as the gentleman has well pointed out, it throws directly into the market place a hazard of $55 on a thousand pounds of meat which is enough to destroy any basic food commodity industry.

Mr. HOPE. There is no question about that. Let me point out also that if all cattle were produced and kept on the same farm until they went to the slaughter house that would be one thing. But most of the cattle business is not done that way. Cattle are produced on a ranch, they are then sold to a feeder or to a cattleman who carries them on grass or roughness for a year or so. They may change hands several times before going to the packing house. The fallacy of this order is that the man who has bought cattle before the order at the high prices he has had to pay to get them in order to stay in business is bound to take a loss. There is no way he can escape it. His inventory has been reduced by an average of 10 percent immediately. If he holds them until August it will be reduced 4½ percent more and if he holds them until October it will be 4½ percent more. How can a man stay in business when he knows the longer he stays in business the greater his loss will be?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes, and may I say that the gentleman is making a splendid statement. His vast knowledge of agriculture gives him the background necessary for the good statement he has made. We know that a cattle feeder goes into the market and buys a 700-pound steer, perhaps. He pays thirty-five or forty dollars a hundred, or he did last January or February. He has $240 invested in that steer before he puts a bushel of corn or any care whatsoever into it. This order comes out and takes away from that feeder anywhere from $30 to $50 of his capital investment and, together with that, it gives to that particular feeder the feeling of uncertainty in the future. He does not know what he is going to do, whether he should continue in business, or what not. The rollback order will certainly result in less meat, than in more meat, for the consumers.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman certainly has stated that fact in a very effective way, and the situation he has described applies to thousands and hundreds of thousands of beef producers throughout the country.

Let me just give you a typical example which was given me by a cattle producer in my own State just a couple of days ago. He told me he had purchased within the last 3 weeks at existing prices 100 head of heifers in Texas to bring to his ranch in Kansas. They weighed about 500 pounds. He paid 37 cents a pound which was the going price for that weight cattle at that time. He would bring them to Kansas and run them on pasture during the summer and sell them in October, normally. I do not know what he will do now. He paid 37 cents a pound, so he has invested $185 each in those cattle, and without going into detail—he will have $230 invested in each of those cattle next October if he keeps them. This includes freight, pasture charges, interest, selling charges and loss through death and other causes. They are grass cattle; they will grade commercial, and the price ceiling at Kansas City on those cattle next October will be 26 cents a pound. Assuming they gained 200 pounds—and that will be a good gain on grass—his cost at that time would be 33 cents a pound. But, under the rollback he will sell them for 26 cents a pound, lost 7 cents a pound or $49 per head on each of those animals. How long can a cattleman stay in business under those conditions. Does this look like a good way to increase the supply of beef for the American people?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico [Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN.]

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Chairman, I beg to call the attention of the committee to the significance which section 407 of the bill under discussion will have for the citizens whom I represent.

Of course they are citizens of the United States; all 2,200,000 of them. A certain number of them serve the Federal Government. Some of those who serve the Federal Government in Puerto Rico were born in Puerto Rico and were always residents of Puerto Rico. Others were born in the States, and became residents of the island before they became Federal employees. Others became residents while federally employed.

The fact is that, with very few exceptions, Federal jobs in Puerto Rico are as permanent as in the mainland and require permanent residence in the island. The Federal Government operates in Puerto Rico the same as in any State.

The mainlanders who serve the Federal Government in Puerto Rico were residents of Puerto Rico before they became Federal employees or have later become residents of Puerto Rico in order to serve the Federal Government. In either case they are residents of Puerto Rico; they may become legal residents of Puerto Rico after 1 year's residence in the island. Together with them there are many other Federal employees, citizens of the United States, born in Puerto Rico, permanent residents of Puerto Rico. The only difference is that the latter were born in Puerto Rico, as I was, as were the 75,000 who served in the Second World War, as were the boys of the Sixty-fifth Regiment now fighting in Korea.

Puerto Rico is a community of United States citizens, whether they were born in the island, as most were, or in the mainland, as many were. Section 407 will have the following effect:

Am American citizen in a Federal job will get a certain salary if he was a former resident of Puerto Rico. Another American citizen on the same job will get a 25 percent higher salary if he was a resident of the mainland before his appointment.

I agree that if you change your residence from the mainland to the island you have traveling expenses and you have extra expenses for a month or two while you become adjusted.

But the same is true if you change residence from the island to the mainland. I do not see the latter situation taken care of by section 407. And there are Federal workers from the island who are transferred to the mainland now and then, although not as many as those transferred from the mainland to the island.

It would not be logical to hold that the only reason for a higher pay in the offshore areas is to take care only of the temporary extra expenses of some who move from the mainland to offshore areas. If that were the only consideration, the extra pay could be traveling expenses and a per diem for a month or two—for such time as would naturally be needed for adjustment to new surroundings. But there is no limit of time for extra pay in this bill. It can go on for the lifetime of the employee—up to retirement. And it does not apply to a transfer from California to Washington, D. C., or from Washington, D. C. to say Colorado. Certainly there are adjustment expenses there, too.

The reason for the extra pay, as I understand it, is that the cost of living, at comparable standards, has been found to be higher in the offshore areas than in the mainland. I maintain that if this is true it holds equally whether your name is Smith or Martinez.

The result of section 407 would then be that Martinez is supposed to hold to a low standard of living while Smith is to have a higher standard of living, although they hold equal jobs and do equal work.

Mr. Chairman, such a situation would be wrong and unfair. It is self-evident that the average person maintains such standard of living as his income permits; that the average person aspires ever to improve his standard of living. The salary anybody should receive for his toil should be the result of merit and ability and devotion to his work. Therefore, it should not be determined on the basis of place of birth and former residence.

I am not saying whether a differential should be paid or should not be paid in the offshore areas. I would say that it should be paid if the cost of living, at a comparable level, is higher in the offshore areas. Should this question be decided in the affirmative, as it is decided under section 407, then the rule should be applied equally to those born and those employed where their job is and to those who came over from another location to hold a job at the same place.

The Puerto Rican-born person and the mainland-born resident of Puerto Rico must meet the same tests to become Federal employees as does the mainlander who is transferred from the continent to the island. They are entitled to the same standard of living. Consequently they are entitled to equal compensation.

Of course there are many persons in Puerto Rico now living at low levels because they are unemployed or underemployed. There are many, too, who live at high levels—as high as in any comparable mainland community. The goal should be for all United States citizens in Puerto Rico to live at standards comparable to those of the mainland. The goal should not be to mold the undesirable low levels of the unfortunate into frozen standards for all residents, while nonresidents may enjoy a higher standard.

I believe that to determine whether an extra pay in the offshore areas is justified or not is one question; to make salary discriminations between former residents and newcomers is another question.

If it were found that the cost of living at comparable standards does not justify the payment of an extra compensation, such compensation should not be paid to any.

But if it is justified, let it be paid to all, regardless of place of birth or former residence. A loaf of bread costs every bit as much to a person who got his job in Puerto Rico as it does to a person recruited on the mainland and shipped over.

With section 407 we risk the creation of a most undesirable situation, one which might lead the people of Puerto Rico to conclude rightly that they have become the victims of discrimination.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

(Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I want to add a brief statement to what has been said with regard to the Office of Price Stabilization order to roll back the price of meat by 10 percent at this time, and 9 percent later on.

The thing that causes me to make a further statement on this subject matter is because of comments and statements in the local newspapers by people who are not familiar with the problem and who are casting reflection upon a group of substantial and responsible citizens who ask nothing from the Government in the way of hand-outs and who want to contribute to the welfare of our country. Some of the statements would have you believe that livestock producers would threaten a sit-down strike. Farmers and livestock men do not go on strike. So far as I know, no group of farmers have suggested such thing.

I want to point out briefly some of the inconsistencies with regard to this problem. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] has just made a good statement on this subject matter. We are told on the one hand there is a scarcity of beef. I remind you that beef is the only item under this order. Beef is meat from cattle. It is estimated that less than 5 percent of living expenditures goes for meat and less than half of it is spent for beef that is bought at the butcher shop or in the grocery store. Of course, the price of beef is extremely high. It comes about because of more beef being bought now than ever before.

If the Office of Price Stabilization had issued an order putting a ceiling price on beef or livestock as of the date the order was issued, it would not be so bad, but here is a case where a Government order or directive says in substance that property you owned on April 1 or April 20 is worth 10 percent less on May 20, whether you like it or not, and that later this summer by order of the Government, the price of your product will be reduced by at least 9 percent more. Not only that, but the confusion that will come about and the uncertainty that will result will even create further reduction in price. I know of no other industry or business where the Government has taken this kind of action.

Furthermore, under the order the slaughtering of beef is limited to not more than 90 percent of the amount slaughtered a year ago. So you are going to have less beef, and according to the order, at lower prices. Mr. DiSalle says there is a shortage of beef, and yet he says you can have not more than 90 percent of what you got a year ago.

While I am interested in all of those engaged in the livestock business, I am especially concerned with regard to the smaller operator, the farmer who raises a crop and feeds that crop to his livestock in order to fatten them and put them on the market, and expects a market price for his cattle. This order is certainly unfair to such person. The farmer I described not only loses his feed but a year's work in his farm operations. It is the way by which he markets his crop. He is the fellow who is going to get hurt. He is the backbone of this country. There are hundreds of thousands of them. Even the threat of a roll-back is going to injure them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If the production were required because of a scarcity of some material, we would have a different situation. We might cut down the production of automobiles because of a scarcity of steel, or you might cut down some in building industry because of scarcity of materials needed in the war effort. Instead of having more of the product you have less, because the person who buys this livestock for the purpose of feeding it is not going to increase the weight of that animal by 200 or 300 pounds as he would otherwise do. He is going to sell that animal at a lesser weight and therefore we will lose that much beef.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished member of this subcommittee.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The last point the gentleman brought out is especially pertinent. The gentleman has fed steers in his time, and he would be nothing other than foolish if he had a hundred head on hand at this time and was faced with what is in view today, if he did not try to decide in his own mind the question, "Had I better try to unload while the unloading is good?" Unfortunately, each of the steers he does sell early will be lightweight, at least 200 pounds on an average. That is, it could have produced 200 pounds of additional beef for the consumer had it gone to maturity. This will result in hundreds of millions of pounds of beef lost to the consumer which would not have occurred if the OPS had kept its hands off and given to our cattle feeders the opportunity to feed out the cattle to prime condition.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And the quality of the beef will not be as good.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska who comes from a great agricultural area.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course the President has the power of price control, under the Defense Production Act of 1950, title IV.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. To bolster up your argument of what is happening to the feeder of live cattle, I call attention to one or two sentences of that act, which also confirms what the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture, told us a while ago regarding the loss with which the feeder is confronted as a result of the roll-back order. I do not know whether the administration is violating the intent of the act or not, but I call your attention to section 401, title

IV, of the Price and Wage Stabilization Act, which reads:

That the purpose of the act is to prevent inflation and other things; also to stabilize the cost of living for workers and other consumers and the cost of production for farmers.

We do not get anything near the cost of production. The purpose of the act is to give cost of production to the farmer, and this roll-back order violates the intent of the Defense Production Act, in my opinion. I believe the arguments of two or three hundred representative farmers who are in town today urging some revision of this act should be heeded, because we are going to have to extend this act. This act expires June 30, and the Committee on Banking and Currency will come here soon asking for an extension of this act. I think we should have something to say about that when that matter comes up for extension, but I do believe that every Member from a farming district should read this act. I think you should read this language. I should like to get some opinion as to whether or not Mr. DiSalle is violating the intent of the act which is stated:

The purpose of the act is to give the farmers cost of production.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad the gentleman from Nebraska has made a very important observation. I am sure Congress intended that livestock producers should have cost of production of their commodities.

As I said a while ago, beef prices are high. This is not the way to deal with this very important commodity. A commodity that is a part of the food supply of the Nation.

The OPS order is not the way to deal with this problem. The farmer should be given a chance to produce more and more food of all kinds and not be hampered by rules and regulations that make his prospects for production even more uncertain than they are.

There are many elements that enter into it other than those we have been talking about, including weather conditions, loss by disease, and other things.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee.

Mr. WHITTEN. In connection with this subject I do not think we should pass it by without pointing out that under the price control law the Price Control Administrator does not have to take into consideration cost of production; that under the parity formula the cost of production does not enter into it. But there is one man who has got to take into consideration the cost of production, and that is the man who is growing the beef, the farmer; he has to do it or go into bankruptcy. I have said repeatedly that the Government might just as well recognize that the farmer has got to take it into consideration even though they are not required to do it under either of the laws we have referred to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

To ignore the basic laws of farming or any other kind of work even though the laws of Congress permit them to be ignored, is very short-sighted and can only lead to reduced production, to rationing, and to less and less at higher and higher prices.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I agree with what the gentleman from Mississippi has said, but I do not see how he can differ with me in the interpretation of the purpose of this price-control act which is stated to be to stabilize the cost of living for workers and for consumers and the cost of production for farmers and businessmen.

Mr. WHITTEN. Let me say to the gentleman from Nebraska that perhaps I did not use the right word; it may be that I should have said that it may not require him to do it; certainly he has not based any ruling that he had made on the cost of production, whether required or not, and it is a question of what is the right thing to do under the circumstances.

Mr. STEFAN. And one thing that the farmer cannot ignore is the cost of production.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is correct.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN].

(Mr. SEELY-BROWN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, it is my considered opinion that the problem of the New England farmer is not being solved in general by the present over-all agricultural policy of this country; and my purpose in rising at this time is not to be destructive in my criticism, but rather in hopes of bringing a constructive suggestion to your committee.

After two decades of well-meant spending, agriculture still operates under programs that are obviously temporary expedients; so I say as we try to work out a permanent agricultural program; as we look to the future, let us first analyze some of the permanent advances we have made in the past. To list a few: Hybrid corn, improved crop varieties, better fertilizing, better spraying, artificial insemination, quick freezing, improved power and machinery, and so forth, and may I call to your attention that all of these permanent advances in agriculture have one common characteristic, they have been won by scientific research. The amounts of money which we have spent thus far in agricultural research are piddling compared with the amounts of money which we have spent for the support of agricultural products. The amounts of money which we have spent for agricultural research are nothing when compared with the amounts of money we have spent for research on instruments of destruction.

I believe it will be cheaper for the taxpayer, it would be more profitable for the farmers everywhere, it would be more beneficial for consumers everywhere, if we approached the problem of agriculture, both from the point of view of the producer and consumer, with the same scientific approach we have used for the development of the atomic bomb. Now is the time to make available for research the largest sums of research money that science can use.

I want to search for new crops to prevent surplus production and to provide new goods for human use. I want to look for new uses for the crops which we presently are growing. I want to look for new ways to utilize existing surpluses. I want to look for new ways to cut the cost of production and to make our agricultural abundance available to more and more people at lower costs and I say to you with all sincerity that not only the farmer but everybody benefits from the permanent advances of science.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, this bill is of great importance to we who live in Montana where we have extensive forests. The Farm Credit Administration, the Farmers Home and Soil Conservation Service, the Research and Rural Electrification are all immensely important to us. But I want to address my remarks particularly to one provision in the bill. I do not see how it can legally work and I would like to have particularly the attention of the committee so that I may make my argument and see if they do not agree with me. I refer to page 26, lines 18 to 25, which reads as follows:

Provided, That hereafter no part of the appropriation for "Cooperative range improvements" shall be expended in any national forest until funds or other contributions at least equal to such expenditures are made available by States or other local public or private sources, except that claims recognized by the act of December 29, 1950, shall be accepted as contributions for the purposes of this section.

I do not believe that provision can be carried out under present law. It is my understanding that at the proper time a point of order will be made against this provision on the ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has said that if a point of order is made against it he will ask that the whole paragraph be stricken. I hope he does not do that because the paragraph is impossible to carry out under present law.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I will say that I would have to do that because the appropriation is made strictly contingent one upon the other and that is the feeling of the committee. This is no threat. The two parts go together.

Mr. D'EWART. I would like to have the gentleman follow my argument because he has given us something that if left in the bill in the way it is, we cannot get the appropriation for range improve-

ment. I think he will agree with me when he hears what I have to say.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the language is prohibitive and the intent is not possible within the law.

Section 12 of Public Law 478, Eighty-first Congress, reads as follows:

Of the moneys received from grazing fees by the Treasury from each national forest during each fiscal year there shall be available at the end thereof when appropriated by Congress an amount equivalent to 2 cents per animal-month for sheep and goats and 10 cents per animal-month for other kinds of livestock under permit on such national forest during the calendar year in which the fiscal year begins, which appropriated amount shall be available until expended on such national forests, under such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, for (1) artificial revegetation, including the collection or purchase of necessary seed; (2) construction and maintenance of drift or division fences and stock-watering places, bridges, corrals, driveways, or other necessary range improvements; (3) control of range-destroying rodents; or (4) eradication of poisonous plants and noxious weeds, in order to protect or improve the future productivity of the range.

You will note that the 2 cents for sheep and 10 cents for cattle per animal-month can be spent, when appropriated for four purposes. There is no requirement for matching funds such as proposed in the pending bill.

It is proposed here that the matching be done by State or other local public or private sources. There is some question as to whether States could legally appropriate funds for this purpose. Also, the State legislatures have concluded their sessions and there would be no possibility of getting funds for this fiscal year from that source. Private funds possibly could be obtained, but by the time this bill becomes law it will be a difficult source of matching funds for the coming fiscal year.

Evidently in recognition of this situation, the provision is made that claims recognized by the act of December 29, 1950, shall be accepted as contributions for the purposes of this section.

The act of December 29, 1950, makes certain sums available to the States with this provision:

Such sums shall be expended by such States in accordance with the terms of the acts of May 28, 1908, and March 1, 1911, as amended.

The portion of these acts with which we are concerned reads as follows:

Twenty-five percent of all moneys received during any fiscal year from each national forest shall be paid, at the end of such year, by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State in which such national forest is situated, to be expended as the State legislature may prescribe for the benefit of the public schools and public roads of the county or counties in which such national forest is situated.

In other words the money made available to the States under the Act of December 29, 1950, is earmarked for a specific purpose, to wit: "for the benefit of the public schools and public roads," and therefore cannot be used as proposed in lines 23 through 25 on page 26.

In other words, the money is earmarked for this particular purpose and cannot be used for any other. Therefore, without the Congress changing the act, the funds cannot be used for matching.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman from Montana, I think, is eminently correct in what he has to say about this particular section. I do not think it will work, but in addition to that the act of December 29, 1950, is an act which was passed out of our committee, as I think the gentleman will remember, which involves $1,350,000 which the Forestry Service illegally diverted from funds due to the counties for the support of the public schools and the public roads. We passed a bill last session, as the gentleman will remember, involving 15 States, all of which had been illegally and improperly deprived of these funds. Now the appropriation subcommittee comes along and says: "Well, you can use that $1,350,000 to match $700,000 which we put in this bill, which is patently legislation on an appropriation bill, and at the same time deprives these counties of the moneys to which they are entitled and was illegally taken away from them and diverted from the uses which the law says the money should be put.

Mr. D'EWART. The law we wrote stated this money was to be paid to the States for use on public schools and roads. Now the Committee on Appropriations says, without changing the act we have passed, that we will use it to match funds on the national forests. That cannot be done without changing the act we passed here in Congress. Neither can those funds be taken out of the State treasuries without additional appropriations by the States, and their legislatures cannot make these appropriations because they are not in session.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think the gentleman has built up a pretty good case as to the difficulties under which this provision would put certain States and the entire program. I would suggest to him that when we read the bill for amendment, rather than making a point of order against that provision, that he offer an amendment to strike out that provision, and I would be glad personally to accept such an amendment.

Mr. ENGLE. I am glad to hear what the gentleman, a member of the committee has had to say, but striking this last clause which relates to the Act of December 29, 1950 will not give these people the money, $1,350,000, of which they were illegally deprived. I should like to know whether or not the committee would be willing then to permit us to have that.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is asking for too much at this time. I think I have conceded plenty.

Mr. ENGLE. By conceding what has been conceded the gentleman has conceded what has been conceded to be illegal and subject to a point of order.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman realizes that the chairman of the subcommittee has stated that if a point of order is made to that provision in this paragraph he will insist on the point of order against the entire paragraph, which is his right. I am just trying to show the gentleman a way to accomplish his purpose without losing the $700,000 that now is in the bill.

Mr. D'EWART. This $700,000 was paid by the stock men for the purpose of range improvement at the rate specified in the law. I do not think the committee wants to refuse the money for that purpose. I doubt if the committee want to refuse the use of the money for the purpose for which it was collected. Striking the whole provision out of the bill will lose that money for the improvement of the ranges that was paid in by the stock men for that purpose. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman that we should have an opportunity to match these funds, and the forest users would quite likely like to match them, but the Forest Service has usually taken the position that it does not want private funds spent on national forests because it might institute what is known as a vested interest. It has discouraged that.

We do not want to lose the original $700,000. We hope some way, as suggested by the gentleman from Minnesota, can be worked out so we can save this money. It cannot be saved as it is written in the bill, because it is illegal, and it cannot be saved if the whole provision is stricken out. We hope we can get together on a solution.

(Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON].

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I concur completely in the remarks of the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN, with regard to section 407 of the bill as reported by the committee.

It seems to me most unfortunate that the committee has chosen this method for dealing with the problem of the difference in the cost of living in the States and in the Territories and possessions. I am confident that if the members of the committee had given this subject more thorough consideration they would have concluded that the incorporation of this provision in the bill is not only unwise but extremely unfair to the employees of the Department of Agriculture.

The question with which we are dealing is not principally that of whether or not the differential should be paid but the basis upon which it should be paid. The chairman of the committee has suggested that this subject should be dealt with by general law. But there already is general law by which this subject can be dealt with. The gentleman from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] pointed this out earlier in this debate. He told you of the provision incorporated in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act

of 1948 under which payment of the differential must be based on differences in cost of living.

The differential that was paid in Hawaii was reduced from 25 percent to 20 percent something less than a year ago under the provisions of this law.

I do not know whether the members of the committee realize that not long ago a subcommittee of the other body visited the Territory of Alaska and found differences in the cost of living there so much greater than in the States and of such vital importance to the problem of compensating people in the national-defense work that they have asked for an immediate survey by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the cost of living in that Territory. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has since requested funds to carry out such a survey in both the Territory of Alaska and the Territory of Hawaii. It has just completed a survey in Puerto Rico and in the District of Columbia. I do not think it is appropriate to deal with this general subject of compensation in the Territories and possessions until we have the facts which that survey will provide. I hope therefore the Congress, in the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill, which is now in the other body, will provide adequate funds to carry out this survey. Then we will have the facts with which to carry out the general law for the application of the principle of paying a differential in outlying areas.

What does this section do to the Territory of Hawaii? We had in Hawaii on January 1 this year a total of 21,836 civilian employees on the Federal payroll. The number now is probably nearer 25,000. Of that number 184—only 184—are on the payroll of the Department of Agriculture.

What would this amendment do? This amendment would say to those employees who are residents of Hawaii, "You do not get the differential, but if you are a resident of the States, you will get the differential." Obviously it is unfair. The Federal Government learned, soon after the policy of paying the differential was introduced, that you cannot as a practical matter pay one man 25 percent more than another when they are doing exactly the same work, just because one of them comes from the States and the other one comes from Hawaii. That sort of thing discourages people from establishing citizenship in Hawaii.

There are too many people there who would like to make Hawaii their home, but do not do so because they want to have voting representation in the Congress. They know that when they have a Congressman here who is voting in the House, or a Senator who votes in the other body they are in an infinitely better position to protect themselves than when they are represented only by Delegates, or a Resident Commissioner who do not have the right to vote.

You know this business of not having the right to vote is like breathing fresh air—it is something you do not miss until you do not have it.

I want to point this out also. This whole program of paying a differential was calculated to draw people to those areas for defense purposes. It is something which was originated by the Federal Government and not by the people in the Territories and insular possessions. Today we need 500 to 1,000 new mechanics at Pearl Harbor. Most of the men who were drawn there during World War II having these special skills have gone. The Navy has been advertising as far east as Boston to draw men to Hawaii. And here it is proposed to break down by this amendment the whole system by which such men were originally induced to go to Pearl Harbor.

This is colonialism—that is what it is. You should not pay one scale of wages to the people from the States, and another scale of wages to people in the outlying areas.

It is wrong in principle.

It is unfair.

It is destructive of efficiency in the Federal service. I do not think there is anything about it which is justified.

I appeal to the members of the committee to do as the subcommittee on the Interior Department appropriation did, and accept the amendment of the delegate from Alaska that the section be withdrawn.

I want to point out that in the committee report reference is made only to the situation in Puerto Rico. I think the decision on this question should be ruled by principle, but do believe all the facts pertinent to its application should be given consideration. There is nothing in the report or in the hearings about Hawaii and Alaska. I think the same principle should apply to all Territories and possessions, but the conditions in all of those areas are very different. I understand that in Alaska the cost of living is 40 or 50 percent above what it is in Seattle. The situation we have in Hawaii is somewhat different. It should be evident from that this question need further consideration before action is taken on it.

I hope therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the members of the subcommittee will accept the amendment which the delegate from Alaska will offer at the proper time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the delegate from Hawaii has expired.

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time for the purpose of making a few observations on the question before us. Although I recognize and regret exceedingly that most of these gentlemen who are interested in agriculture and the prosperity and welfare of our farmers have not at all times unfortunately voted for anything that might be in the interest of the consumer or the people who make it possible for them to dispose of their great crops and everything they produce.

For 10 years the farm organizations have fought for a parity program for agriculture. Before I proceed I want to say that I shall again, as I have consistently done for 45 years, vote for appropriations in aid for our farmers, because if my side would not do so, the farmer would have to look to God alone for help. But I do not see why they do not try to help themselves by supporting those who are with them and who have guided them to their present prosperity.

As I started to say, Mr. Chairman, for 10 years the farm organizations have fought for a parity program for agriculture. Unfortunately for the consumers, a number of farm products are away above parity, such as cotton and wool, while meats are above the support price.

Though 90 percent of the American people are pleading for price controls, the representatives of the livestock growers, the feeders, and the packers are here in force endeavoring to nullify the order of Price Control Administrator DiSalle which will roll back all meat prices from the farm to the consumer table, which to my mind should have been done 6 months or more ago. I realized what would happen, and it has happened. The prices of all foodstuffs and the necessities of life have gone sky high.

They seem to be reinforced by Mr. Wilson, Defense Production Administrator, who appears to be rather indifferent to the plight of the masses, but who has, so far as I have been able to observe, played into the hands of these profiteers. In his testimony before the House Banking and Currency Committee yesterday, he called himself a reluctant witness. Instead of fighting for the program of the administration, he permits the opposition to play with his weak and qualified statements in support of an official order of one branch of his agency. He stated: "We hope to use these controls only during the period while we are expanding production," and that he "hoped in a couple of years we will be able to remove controls, which are, after all, a comparative hardship—only comparative."

It might be well to ask Mr. Wilson and his Republican friends just who suffers the hardship resulting from these controls in a great emergency? Does he give any thought to the masses who labor to produce the materials of defense, who, after a hard days' work come home to a scant table devoid of the one food item that gives him strength to labor and toil? No. His mind is apparently centered on one factor—profits and more profits for big business, big agriculture, big dealers in meats and other necessary foodstuffs. It is high time, gentlemen, that we consider the plight of the human element first, instead of basing all our actions on the dollar profit of those selfishly and greedily enhancing their ill-gotten gains in all crises.

At some later date I will point out the fallacy of the position Mr. Wilson has taken. Today, however, I wish especially to call attention to the fact that all those trying to destroy and nullify the order which will bring some relief to the consumer have made greater profits in 1950, and are continuing to add to those profits in the first quarter of 1951, than they ever made before. While Mr. Wilson hesitates to go all out for this order before the committee, he shows no "reluctance" for a moment in handing over to these giant interests, not millions but billions, to build plants and expand their

facilities to add more millions to their profits.

I have tried to obtain figures on the profits of the so-called feeders but as I do not have the correct ones, I shall not attempt to quote them, but I know their profits have been tremendous.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I believe the gentleman speaks of these statistics put out by the Department of Agriculture. They show that the average laboring man today in Chicago or for that matter anywhere else, can buy more meat today with an hour's work than he could back in 1929. Certainly the gentleman knows that the average wage of the working man has gone up two or three times since 1929. Can he not see the viewpoint of the farmers who today, like myself, in order to get additional help, the only help we can secure back on that farm in Minnesota this spring, is at the rate of a dollar an hour for a man 55 years of age, rather than a monthly wage of $150 a month, which we paid last year. I am just asking the gentleman to look at our side of the picture.

Mr. SABATH. I am; that is the reason I have at all times voted to aid the farmer, because when the farmer is prosperous, when he makes money he is able to buy things for his family; he is able to buy machinery and spend money which creates business and employment; I recognize that, and I have been criticized in my district frequently for supporting the agricultural program. Unfortunately, however, the consumer notwithstanding the gentleman's statement, is not in the position he says. Today very few average wage earners can afford to buy real cuts of meat; they cannot even afford to buy the cheaper cuts; consequently the statement the gentleman makes is not justified by the facts. I know many people in my city who are in that situation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The only thing is that I am quoting statistics as gathered by the Department of Agriculture; it is not my statement.

Mr. SABATH. I know that labor has received increases, but they have not accumulated the wealth the farmers have, and I do not begrudge it to them. I remember when farms were being foreclosed. That is not the case today. I am told that in many communities farmers have accumulated so much money under the Democratic administration that even the banks in their localities will not accept any more deposits because they have too much money on hand now belonging to the farmers.

Mr. Chairman, reference has been made to the increase in wages. In that connection may I say that I admit there has been an increase in wages from time to time, but you know and I know that the industries have not suffered. The fact is these men who have received some increase have produced tremendous wealth for industry, they have aided our industries in making millions upon millions of dollars; in fact, the industries, notwithstanding the increase in wages, have made greater profits and have greater surpluses than ever before in the history of the United States. Of course, some people feel that they have made too much and that they can very easily increase the wages of their workers by a greater percentage than they have and still make millions in profits.

I am of the opinion, in view of conditions and the prosperity which was brought to the farmers of this country due to the aid of our Government, that this fact should be appreciated.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The aid of our Government and under the leadership of the Democratic Party.

Mr. SABATH. I am just coming to that, and I thank our majority leader for calling attention to it.

Mr. Chairman, when you consider the financial condition of the farmer, the livestock raiser and the feeder today, and compare it with the plight they were in in 1933 when the Democratic Party took over a financially unsound economy, it is difficult to understand the failure of the farmers of our country to appreciate the improvement that has come to them. Many of them are still being led astray by the Republican Party and its leaders who have never done anything for them. The Democratic Party has done more for the farmer, assisting in the solution of his problems during adverse periods, than all of the controlled Wall Street parties in all history. Every section of our country, including the cotton- and peanut-growing States, has been well taken care of by this Democratic administration, and yet we find some of the representatives from the cotton- and peanut-growing States lining up with the Republicans as part of the coalition which is now endeavoring to scuttle the farm program of this administration.

Many of you here will remember, and it is an historical fact, that in 1932, under the Hoover Republican administration, wheat was selling at 38 cents a bushel, corn at 32 cents, cotton at 6½ cents a pound and peanuts were 1½ cents a pound. Farmers were staggering under a mortgage load almost unbearable, with interest rates so outrageously high they were scandalous, and foreclosures so general they had to call out the State police in many sections to prevent bloodshed. The mortgage bankers and Wall Street was squeezing the last drop of blood out of the American farmer, while the Republican administration sat placidly by acquescing by its inaction in the plundering and destruction of this solid core of our economy. It was this Democratic Administration that came to the rescue of the farmer in that dark hour. It was the Roosevelt administration that launched the first constructive program of aid and assistance to the tiller of the soil.

It is also rather significant that in the last full year of the Hoover Republican administration there was appropriated for the Department of Agriculture less than $300,000,000.

With the advent of the present Democratic administration in 1933 under our great leader, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, there was launched the greatest program of aid and assistance to the farmer this or any other country ever experienced. The Roosevelt administration set up the following comprehensive program to improve the lot of agriculture:

First. A credit program.

Second. A program of research to expand production.

Third. A production and marketing administration.

Fourth. A rural electrification program, which today provides 85 percent of our farm homes with electric light and power.

Fifth. An extension service to better the health, education and recreation facilities in farm areas.

Sixth. A program of loans for farm home construction.

Seventh. A comprehensive forestry program.

Eighth. A soil conservation and flood control program.

This all took money. When we appropriated the huge sums necessary, I well remember how my Republican colleagues shouted this would bankrupt the Nation. In the years 1939, 1940, 1941, appropriations for agriculture exceeded the billion mark each year, reaching $1.5 billions in the latter year. It was in 1917 that Congress adopted the first billion-dollar budget for the operation of the entire Government. What a hew and cry was raised by my Republican colleagues at that time. And yet, today, I dare say there is not a Member on this floor who would challenge the wisdom of the expenditures made for agriculture during the years 1939, 1940, 1941, all of which exceeded the total Government budget in 1917.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman is claiming so much credit for the Democrats, but will the gentleman also take credit for the high prices the consumers must pay toward the national debt?

Mr. SABATH. I am fully aware of the high prices that the consumer pays, and that is mostly because of the high profits exacted by big business on everything the wage earner must buy.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Congress of the United States, this very body, refused to give the President powers, in particular when the President sought the power to regulate gambling of any food on the commodity markets, and the greater portion of the Republican Members, or practically all of them, voted to deny that power to the Federal Government.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Who controls the Congress?

Mr. McCORMACK. Never mind.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. You are in control.

Mr. McCORMACK. You have your responsibility. Are you not a Member of the House?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. This is a Democratic administration.

Mr. McCORMACK. Are you not a Member of the House? You have your individual responsibility.

Mr. SABATH. I am only inclined to bring home facts and I do not want to hurt any present Member, because I think the present Members on the Republican side will commence to realize that it is their duty to cooperate with us, who believe in bringing down the high cost of living, and that they will not follow those who are trying every day in the week and every week in the month and every month in the year to increase prices. This Democratic administration has tried to control that, but unfortunately in the last few years you gentlemen on that side—I do not mean all of you—I mean those reactionaries that control the Republican Party, have inveigled some of the Democrats to join hands and bring about an unholy alliance, and in that way, though the Democrats have a paper majority, your coalition is in the saddle, and you showed it only a few days ago when you really scuttled the bill and the appropriations for a department that is vitally concerned with the proper conduct and efficient administration of the Government.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the gentleman that the Republican Party generally does believe in saving money for the taxpayers and wage earners. In that respect I do agree with the gentleman. However, I feel that in view of the remarks that the majority leader made, it should be pointed out that the amendment to the Defense Production Act to which he called attention, regarding gambling in the commodity markets, was introduced and offered by a Democrat, the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, and was passed in a Democratic Congress, and therefore certainly cannot be laid at the door of the Republican Party, which seems to be the effort. Whenever there is any legislation in a Democratic Congress which does not seem to appeal to the gentlemen, then they say it is the fault of the Republicans for passing it.

Mr. SABATH. I do not like to charge the Republicans with all of their offenses and shortcomings. I am calling attention to only a few of them. There are so many that I would be obliged to use the entire time only for that purpose, and I do not desire to do that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], whom I like very much and admire, is very adroit. He is elected by the people of his district, as is every one of us, without regard to party, to be a Member of this body. The gentleman from New York, and all of us, have the responsibility in our own right to vote for the best interests of the country and the best interests of the people. The gentleman from New York ought to know now, if he did not know then, that that vote was directly against the best interests of the people, to permit gambling in food on the commodity exchanges of the country. Each and every one of those who voted for that amendment, no matter who offered it, have their responsibility, whether they are Democrats or Republicans.

Mr. KEATING. If the gentleman will yield so that I may reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts, may I say that I agree with the majority leader as to the responsibility of the individual Members of Congress. It so happens that on this particular issue I believe I voted the same way the gentleman from Massachusetts did. The thing I am objecting to is trying to throw at the door of the Republican Party the responsibility for not passing legislation or for passing legislation in a Democratic Congress. It just does not make sense.

Mr. SABATH. I know it does not make sense when the Republicans wean over a few reactionary Democrats and control nearly every proposition that is brought into this House. We are helpless. The Democratic majority in the House is helpless now, due to the coalition that exists. I presume in a short space of time that coalition will be broken up. If not, there may be another coalition; namely, the progressive, liberal-minded Republicans—and I know many of them dislike to be driven as they are today against their will to vote for measures they do not believe in—will join the honest, sincere, liberal, and progressive Democrats. Then, perhaps, we will put an end to the reactionary crowd that now is in control.

As to the question of gambling, the gentleman from Illinois started the fight against the stock exchange in 1929 and also against gambling on the other exchanges. I succeeded in bringing about some relief, though not the relief I sought. Nevertheles, I hope that gambling on these exchanges will be shortly restricted so as to protect legitimate American business and American industry, and the consumers of our country.

Let me call attention, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, to the enviable position of the American farmer today—all accomplished under the Democratic administration of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman.

(Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

(Mr. CLEVENGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I find this a rather difficult atmosphere to proceed in. I happen to represent one of the greatest agricultural districts in the United States, as well as one of the greatest agricultural States in the United States, and, incidentally one of the greatest manufacturing States.

I am concerned in the beef problem, not so much as to the prices because no honest man can stand here and promise you that beef prices will be less, but I am interested, to sum this matter up very briefly, that the laboring man may have some beef to eat. I was a member of the House Committee on Agriculture for some 8 years. I fought with might and main against the imposition of those controls in the First World War. But I want to say I had a delegation last week from a company that brings feeder cattle in from Montana and western Nebraska to my State for feeding. Many of the men want to cancel their order for feeders. Obviously the farmer does not want to put them on his farm and take a markdown of 10 percent on them right away and then have another 4½ percent taken from his gains in August and another 4½ percent in October. Heaven knows what Mike DiSalle will decide to do in the meantime in addition to that. So this company was hard put to it and many of these feeder cattle, young Angus and young Herefords, if that means anything to the city people, which have a frame to hang a real beef carcass on, are going to the slaughterhouse for a quick loss. Because they shrink rapidly many of those men who ship them cannot keep them and maintain them for a long time, and they have to move them.

I had a packer here on Monday a week ago who has a business of about four millions of dollars a year. He is one of those little packers that the gentleman from Chicago expressed an interest in some years heretofore. He has a ceiling imposed on all of his beef products. He can only go so far in the market for cattle and then he has to stop. I have the biggest little market of livestock—it is not so little, either—it is bigger than some whole States. As I was saying I have the biggest little market of cattle and hogs at Archbold, Ohio. They also have a packing house. That man sat outside here on Monday morning to see me because he is up against this ceiling and he cannot mark his products up, and he has to mark his inventory down. He had doubled his hog-killing capacity but get no quota to use it. I do not think anyone, should inflation get worse in the United States, can promise that beef will be cheaper, but what I would like to be sure of is that we have some beef to eat. I predicted during the First World War that we would have a black market, and that is exactly what happened. I voted against it. No man has ever heard me stand in the well of this House and ask any subsidy or any handout or any wet-nursing for agriculture in the State of Ohio from the Federal Government. We were spreading lime and practicing crop rotation and soil conservation before most of the Members of this House were born. We are still practicing it. We did not need to be told that. I think perhaps they may have gotten the idea from the State of Ohio and probably Lancaster County up here in Pennsyl-

vania, got the idea from us about the necessity of taking care of the land.

Last Monday when these men bid as high as they could in auctions in my district for cattle buyers from as far east as New Jersey or New York, and these vital areas where maldistribution, as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], spoke about, is already taking place, they bought these cattle at a price over the ceiling which our local packer could pay. You are going to lose the blood and the hides and the pharmaceutical byproducts and most of those things when they go out in the orchard or some old barn or shed to slaughter the cattle. That is what you are going to lose; you will eat uninspected beef. You are going to send millions of these cattle to the market light in weight and 200 or 300 pounds per carcass will be lost. When they put this on before, I had 228 Herefords on my farm in 1943, and had raised nearly 400 hogs, or something over 350 that year, as I remember. But they took every single man off of the farms and left my brother, who was 55 years of age, on a farm of that size without any help. They are beginning to strip the farms again. They are beginning to strip the Ohio farms and the farms in Illinois and Indiana and Iowa of men now. I have asked the Secretary of State, when he comes before our Appropriations Committee, if Mexico is a member of the United Nations, and he says, "Yes." And then I have said, "Why must I help provide a haven for young Mexicans of military age while we strip many of our farms of the last available man and send them to Korea, this police action, as you call it?"

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am mindful of the fact that the gentleman is a member of the subcommittee handling State Department funds. I do not want to divert him, but can the gentleman tell us this afternoon perhaps when that bill is going to be brought before the House?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I do not have the slightest guess.

Mr. CANFIELD. Has the bill been marked up?

Mr. CLEVENGER. Not at all. It has not been taken up.

Mr. CANFIELD. I wonder why.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I do not know, but I am intrigued by one thing, and that is that 90 percent slaughter order. Perhaps I have the answer to it, because I remember a gentleman who came to us with all sincerity and said that in 1944 we should reserve a certain percentage of the steers for breeding purposes. Some of you Members from the Corn Belt know that you do not increase the number of beef or pork or chickens with steers and barrows and capons. That may be the reason for that 90 percent killing order.

I am telling you that the black market will start that, rather soon.

You may not notice this for 4 or 5 months but these cattle you are driving to quick slaughter now are the meat of next January, February, and March, after the corn in the Corn Belt has been put into them. Do not let them kid you when you go downtown and buy a slice of prime ribs of beef for $2.50. They are not prime ribs of beef at all. They are just good cow beef. Most of them are commercial grades. They are not prime ribs of beef at all, just commercial United States Good grades.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WOOD].

(Mr. WOOD of Idaho asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I want to address the House this afternoon on just one matter.

My State of Idaho is almost 500 miles long and attains a width of over 300 miles. My district, the northern half of the State, is 360 miles long from north to south. Seventy-five percent of it is taken up by Government land. Most of the Government land in my district is within national forests, mountainous, and much of it covered with very valuable standing timber. Very little of it is taken up in farming. Most of it is subject to just two crops, white pine trees mainly, and metal mining. So those two subjects are of course very close to me in my representation of that district.

We have the largest stand of white pine in the world in my district. Most of it is Government owned. We have had an infestation in that district for some years of the white pine blister rust which, unless eradicated, will destroy millions of dollars' worth of Government owned timber.

I have no doubt that many of the Members have taken trips out to the West at different times and all that I have spoken to have been unanimous in their enthusiasm about our pine-clad hills and slopes and valleys. I think it is the most beautiful place in the world.

Other farmers have to look after their crops. They have to provide the seed. They have to see that the seed is planted. Frequently they have to spray the crop, if it is fruit. They have to look after it in many, many ways, as well as harvest it later. God is our farmer. God planted the trees, and as long as civilization has not interfered too much the crop does pretty well under the divine leadership of the Almighty. He is able to provide the rain, He is able to provide the sunlight, the minerals, and substances in the soil that only can grow a tree. But when civilization comes in some of these infestations are brought in along with the march of progress and civilization. This white-pine blister rust is one of them. White pine, of all the American trees, I think perhaps yields the best crop. It is the highest-priced timber we have in the West. Those of you who are acquainted with it will know that it is straight in grain and possesses very few knots. It is a grade of timber which is highly desirable.

We have had for many years in the West a program of eradication of blister rust, a spore-borne disease which goes through a second phase of its existence on gooseberry bushes and barberry bushes and a few other things. The manner of getting rid of its has been to pull out the ribes, the barberry and such; but in the last 3 years a spray has been found which is better, cheaper, quicker, and more effective than the ordinary method of pulling out the ribes. I have been a Forest Service physician for 46 years and have taken care of many hernias and broken legs where these service workers were pulling out ribes on the mountainside, where the bush gave way too rapidly and he would fall head over heels probably a hundred feet, roll down the hillside with a resulting hernia. I have seen hundreds of those cases. I can appreciate the fact that with the spray which is used at the present time in killing those spore-carrying berries and shrubs that it is a very sane and sensible way to take care of it.

There is an appropriation in this agriculture bill to protect this valuable Government owned timber. It has not been cut down a great deal, about $100,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I want to concur in what my neighbor from Idaho is saying about the need for protecting these very valuable stands of white pine, particularly in the Panhandle of Idaho. It is possible for us to protect our own resources there even though our neighbor, Canada, is not doing so, if we will keep the host plants for these spores eradicated by spraying. I trust that the committee and the House will abide by the decision of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations in this particular item.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. I thank the gentleman from Washington. As I said, the committee cut down the proposed appropriation only $100,000.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Why did they cut $100,000 out of a meritorious thing like this?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. I do not know; I cannot say.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Has anybody said why they should?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. No, not that I have heard.

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. STIGLER. I call the gentleman's attention to page 10 of the report wherein the committee states:

> It is believed that further consolidations of field offices and reductions in supervisory levels in the white-pine blister-rust program will permit the absorption of the reduction without any curtailment of program.

I wish to call your further attention to the fact that this particular project was reduced less than any other one project. We found in our hearings that this particular agency had more supervisors than workers; therefore the cut.

Mr. HORAN. I believe there were some four or five levels of supervision between Washington and the work. I concur with the committee. Because I believe in the project is no excuse for its not being run efficiently, and I believe this was oversupervised. At least we are placing the burden upon those who have this project in hand now.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. I agree with the members of the committee. I am very much in favor of cutting down appropriations when it can be done without sacrificing the service, and I go along with the committee in its cutting $100,000, but I want to see it left at that if possible.

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, on the Hit Parade program some months ago there was a song called the September Song, some of the words of which were "It is a long time from May to September."

I frankly think Mr. DiSalle is going to conclude that the words of that song have some truth in them. This order of his goes into effect in May, but the full effect will come along in September. Between now and September the consumers of America cannot look to Mr. DiSalle for any relief. He does not even pretend that this first roll-back order will benefit the consumers of America. It is definitely done to increase the profits of the processors and handlers of beef cattle. There is not any mistake about that. Yet, somehow or other, the public seems to be under the impression that Mr. DiSalle is going to give them some immediate relief on the price of beef cattle. That just is not true.

After giving to the processors and handlers some additional profits, he comes along and takes 9 cents a pound out of the hide of every beef cattle that goes to the market. That comes out of the pockets of the producers.

I want to say to the committee that I have not definitely made up my mind about the feasibility of the order which Mr. DiSalle has issued and the others which he contemplates issuing. We had him before the House Committee on Agriculture for several long hours, including an all-day session on Monday, and I must say to the membership of the House that he spoke frankly and forthrightly and with a great degree of sincerity. I believe he gave the committee the full benefit of all the information that was then and there available to him. But actually he made out a woefully weak case in his effort to justify the issuance of these orders. He did not have information which the committee deemed pertinent, but he at least admitted he did not have the information there and has assured us he would provide us with the facts and figures.

When I asked him the question what margin of profit he had left for the producers of beef cattle he was utterly at a loss and he had no answer. I said, "Mr. DiSalle, you say that this order deals with margins and you are now before the committee admitting that you do not know what margin you left for the farmer." I pointed out to him that we had been told he had actually left no margin of profit for the producer. Then we asked him who would receive the benefit from this roll-back in prices, what part would go to the processor and what part to the handler, and he was unable to give us the breakdown. But we do know it will not go to the consumer. The consumers should know that and they should know it well.

I am under the impression that the processors and packers of this country are now doing pretty well on the profits they are presently receiving. On Monday night I was invited to attend a meeting of beef cattlemen. There they had a great panel of well-informed persons. They threw the meeting open to the press, and there are a lot of smart men and women representing the press of this country. They were asking very positive, definite, and pertinent questions and I think I can say frankly that they did not get frank and forthright answers and that the beef cattlemen were likewise woefully weak in justifying their opposition to Mr. DiSalle's order.

I do not mean to say that the beef cattle industry cannot show by facts and figures that they are justified in their opposition to the order, but I am frank to say that they failed to show it Monday night at that meeting. I am sure that the Committee on Agriculture is anxious to have all the information we can possibly obtain that will aid our Committee and the Members of Congress in making up our minds what we should do about a continuation of this authority when we are called upon to extend it. I am satisfied that this meat order is going to result in less meat and I am definitely of the opinion that it will result in black market operations of greater magnitude than we have ever known before.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct in those last two statements he has made.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman. I do not think Mr. DiSalle will contend that this order is calculated to increase the production of beef. Then, if it is not going to increase the production of beef and is only going to result in a lower price, certainly by lowering the price you increase the consumer demand and the people will eat more beef; the demand will be greater, and then the question comes up where is the additional beef coming from to meet this additional demand.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. In the discussion with Mr. DiSalle, was the matter brought up in regard to the black markets and what its effect would be on the medicinal parts of the beef?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not think that was, but perhaps you and I and other Members of this House know more about that than Mr. DiSalle does.

Mrs. BOLTON. We have had experiences already, like the shortages in hides.

Mr. COOLEY. You will lose the byproducts and you may actually peril the lives of the people of this country by taking beef cattle out into the backyards and butchering them under unsanitary conditions. I think perhaps this is the most important order that Mr. DiSalle will issue during his stay in office. I am not certain that it is ill-advised, but I do want to say that we want the Secretary of Agriculture to come before the committee, and I want to know how he feels about it. He is the head agricultural man in this country. We have economists and experts in that Department, and I want to know whether he approved it or disapproved it. Then we can act in the light of such information as he may be able to furnish.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. The gentleman heard Mr. DiSalle say that the reason for having to roll these prices back is because the farmers would not sell the live animals to the packers at a price at which they could make a profit on slaughtering them. What I am wondering is, how does Mr. DiSalle think he can force the farmers to sell at a price below what the packers are now offering?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not think Mr. DiSalle can do that and I do no think anybody else can do it, and that is the reason I think black markets will flourish world without end, with all of its evil effects.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I would like to know how you are going to roll back these prices without rolling back wages.

Mr. COOLEY. That is it. When you start to roll back prices somebody is going to get hurt. And who is going to get hurt in this? We know that the farmer is going to get hurt, that is all. It is being rolled back for the one purpose of adding to the profits of the nonfarmer group, the handlers and the processors. If the farmer is going to get hurt, how much is he going to get hurt? If his profits are too enormous, then certainly Mr. DiSalle is justified in bringing profits within reason, but I do want to know that there is profit enough left to constitute some incentive to producers to stay in business.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Does not the chairman of our committee remember that Mr. DiSalle hoped that the consumer might get one-tenth of the benefit, but he had no guaranty that he would, and that was all the hope that he held out for the consumer on this May 20 ruling?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is entirely correct. If the public knew the truth they could understand why we are distressed and disturbed about this order which vitally affects such a large seg-

ment of our population. It is well enough to stand here and talk about the evils of inflation. I think that our Committee on Agriculture is just as disturbed about the possible evils of inflation as any other committee in the House. At the same time, that committee is in a position to get information which I think might be of value to the Members of the House when we come to vote upon this program in the future. So I want to say to the Members that we are approaching the matter impartially and with the one idea of trying to find out the true situation. We will have the cattle industry come before our committee and accord them an opportunity to present their views fully on this important matter, which vitally affects the welfare and future of their business. We will try to arrange for the Secretary of Agriculture to express his views publicly concerning this matter about which he and his associates should certainly be well advised. We, of course, must realize that Mr. DiSalle has a very difficult job. He will probably issue no order which will be universally popular. In all probability all of his orders will be very unpopular with those who feel that they are being placed at a disadvantage or are being forced to change their prices or methods of doing business. If it becomes necessary or desirable to have Mr. DiSalle to return to the committee for the purpose of further discussion of the matter we shall, of course, be glad to afford him an opportunity to do so. In the meantime, I hope that producers will submit reasons, sound arguments, and facts and figures to support their contentions and complaints rather than to file numerous protests without any effort to prove or substantiate or to in any way justify their opposition.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, earlier this afternoon the very able and fair chairman of the subcommittee replied to a question I asked as to the method used by the committee in reaching its recommendation of $15,000,000 for administrative expenses for the Commodity Credit Corporation. I should add that the committee is to be commended for having reduced the amount requested from $20,200,000 to $15,000,000. The chairman of the subcommittee stated in effect that there could be no definite certainty as to exactly what amount was necessary.

Many of my colleagues know that I have been studying the operation of this particular agency for a good many months. From time to time I have reported the facts I have been able to develop and have expressed my very real concern as to whether certain of its operations were in any sense of the word satisfactory or justifiable.

Since the committee report and hearings became available I have tried to examine the evidence pertinent to the point of the amount to be appropriated for this purpose. I have also studied as carefully as I could this agency's report of financial condition and operations as of March 31, 1951, which was made public on Monday. By tomorrow I hope to be able to complete certain comparisons as to the operation of this agency during the last few years with a view to arriving at a figure which I believe should be seriously considered by us as the amount to be provided in this item.

I recognize that this is a limitation or a ceiling. But I think we would all agree that Congress has an obligation itself to place as realistic a limitation as is humanly possible, particularly when we know that another subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee is now working on a budget item which apparently will be in the neighborhood of $60,000,000,000. I submit that wherever we can insure that no unnecessary expenditures will be made by the Federal Government through any of its agencies, it is our clear duty to do that.

At this time, and because so much of the information available to us is in the form of quite complex statistics, I want to make readily accessible to all Members for the RECORD of tomorrow some of the basic data that I have been able to develop.

First, the question has arisen as to the accumulated losses during this current fiscal year on the purchase and disposition of certain of these commodities. I have taken from the March 31 report the figures for inventory in pounds and in dollars on butter, cheese, dried milk, dried eggs, and Irish potatoes. On these five items alone, the decrease since June 30, 1950, in pounds, amount to 505,689,832. The decrease in dollars is $182,982,065.84. The loss on disposition totals $203,845,928.12.

Then, may I point out, and this is extremely significant in terms of arriving at a reasonable amount for these operations, that during this 9-month period the total amount of the carrying charges for these five items is $9,723,301.15. This is certainly money that is gone forever, and largely paid for the storage of these five commodities.

Incidentally, it may be of interest to note that during this same period, the Government purchased 282,584,120 pounds of shelled peanuts, sold 282,580,560 pounds, and that the loss on disposition amounted to $11,244,022.37.

The details as to these facts are as follows:

	Inventory			
	June 30, 1950	Mar. 31, 1951	June 30, 1950	Mar. 31, 1951
	Pounds	*Pounds*		
Butter	161, 649, 213	9, 955, 226	$99, 452, 285. 29	$6, 245, 681. 17
Cheese	58, 902, 053	7, 145	19, 706, 623. 64	2, 480. 03
Milk, dried	362, 931, 819	94, 170, 819	45, 718, 460. 06	12, 399, 571. 96
Eggs, dried	93, 918, 525	67, 568, 688	103, 290, 365. 96	66, 528, 135. 95
Potatoes, Irish		9, 900		19, 800. 00
Total	677, 401, 610	171, 711, 778	268, 167, 734. 95	85, 195, 669. 11

	Purchases, fiscal year through Mar. 31, 1951	Sales, fiscal year through Mar. 31, 1951	Loss on disposition	Carrying charges, fiscal year to Mar. 31, 1951
	Pounds	*Pounds*		
Butter	44, 893, 269	134, 186, 985	$40, 317, 665. 59	$2, 205, 789. 96
Cheese	64, 968, 575	98, 064, 201	24, 044, 954. 26	1, 944, 487. 47
Milk, dried	121, 746, 279	273, 448, 028	36, 938, 604. 79	3, 130, 512. 95
Eggs, dried	25, 227, 545	18, 611, 230	60, 527, 328. 38	1, 972, 389. 25
Potatoes, Irish	40, 838, 998	38, 338, 742	42, 017, 375. 10	470, 121. 52
Total	297, 674, 666	562, 649, 186	203, 845, 928. 12	9, 723, 301. 15

Operations on peanuts (shelled), fiscal 1951 to Mar. 31, 1951

Purchased	pounds	282, 584, 120
Sold	do	282, 580, 560
Loss on sales		$11, 244, 022. 37

Members of the committee frequently pointed out during the course of the hearings that it was simply unrealistic, in view of the situation which confronts us, not to recognize that there is no real likelihood whatever that this agency will have to pay in fiscal 1952 for the cost of storing anything like the amount of these commodities, as was the case in the last fiscal year. In this connection, I have made a comparison of the amounts of inventories of a number of commodities on hand June 30, 1950, and on hand March 31, 1951. First, I have compared 16 commodities which are listed by pounds. This data is as follows:

Comparison of inventories of various commodities under the CCC program

	June 30, 1950	Mar. 31, 1951
	Pounds	*Pounds*
Rice	68, 996, 200	28, 332, 600
Butter	161, 649, 213	9, 955, 226
Cheese	58, 902, 053	7, 145
Milk, dried	362, 931, 819	94, 170, 819
Potato starch	9, 712, 682	2, 779, 505
Wool	454, 752	29, 663
Beans, dry edible	968, 710, 200	731, 319, 400
Cottonseed oil:		
Crude	7, 229, 760	262, 225
Refined	10, 071, 372	195
Cottonseed meal	145, 308, 076	1, 223, 579
Cottonseed linters	60, 818, 158	22, 224, 422
Eggs, dried	93, 918, 525	67, 568, 688
Grain sorghum	4, 127, 422, 400	1, 439, 230, 300
Rosin	384, 685, 817	162, 468, 602
Peas, dry edible	91, 225, 900	44, 532, 700
Seeds, hay and pasture	5, 760, 500	489, 413
Total	6, 561, 211, 062	2, 604, 681, 295

This is a decrease in inventories of 60.3 percent over the beginning of the fiscal year.

Next, I have made an additional comparison of the inventories of seven other commodities on these two dates. They show the same definite trend toward the liquidation of these inventories, and are as follows:

Additional comparison of inventories of commodities under CCC

	June 30, 1950	Mar. 31, 1951
Cotton ..... bales	3,413,635	86,813
Cottonseed ..... tons	211,178	2,941
Flaxseed ..... bushels	13,373,583	5,117,761
Turpentine ..... gallons	2,586,765	500,000
Oats ..... bushels	12,108,620	9,997,233
Rye ..... do	514,624	364,274
Soybeans ..... do	53,017	1,093

Also, I want to call attention to a very significant tabulation appearing in the committee hearings at page 68. This, I submit, offers a graphic illustration of the extremely rapid increase in the corporate administrative expense limitations of the Commodity Credit Corporation in contrast to the progressive reduction of such limitations for the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, the Production Credit Corporation, and the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation and the relatively moderate recent increase in the Federal Intermediate Credit Banks.

I am convinced that the amount provided can and should be further reduced. At this moment I am not prepared to offer any suggestion as to the amount other than to express my opinion, based upon my study of the facts up to this time, that it can be substantial without any real possibility of injury to the sound activities of the Corporation. I shall complete my study of the facts before we meet tomorrow and hope to be recognized to offer a specific amendment. In the meantime I hope that the presentation of these facts will be helpful to all who are interested in making certain that we eliminate from every appropriation or authorization every penny that is not fully justified.

TABLE 6.—*Appropriations, reappropriations, and loan authorizations, fiscal years 1932–49, and budget estimates, 1950*

CORPORATE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE LIMITATIONS

[Millions of dollars]

	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	Budget estimates, 1950
Commodity Credit Corporation	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	0.5	0.7	2.0	2.3	3.5	4.4	5.4	7.2	8.9	8.8	8.5	8.1	12.0
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	15.0	18.0	9.5	7.0	8.5	9.0	8.2	8.2	6.5	4.1	2.5	1.8	1.5
Federal Intermediate Credit Banks	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	1.6	1.1	1.3	1.4
Production Credit Corporation	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	1.6	1.4	1.3	1.3
Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	.3	.2	.2	.1
Total, corporate administrative expense limitations	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	15.5	18.7	11.5	9.3	12.0	13.4	13.6	15.4	15.4	16.4	13.7	12.7	16.3

[Mr. CRAWFORD addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McVEY].

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, we who sit in the Halls of Congress today have the honor and the responsibility of serving our country during one of the most critical periods in history. Our national debt stands at approximately $255,000,000,000. Our President has proposed a budget for the next fiscal year in excess of seventy-one billions.

Congress is being asked to pass upon expenditures the total of which staggers the imagination. Therein lies, however, a great opportunity for Members of Congress to evaluate the merits of each proposal in relation to our national needs and to discriminate between what is necessary and those items which appear annually more or less as a matter of habit. It is absolutely essential that all nondefense expenditures be cut to a bare minimum consistent with the operation of an efficient government. All measures that can await a return to normal conditions should be appraised in terms of tax burdens already imposed and those that will be added in order to meet an ever-expanding defense program.

Some of the appropriations for executive departments have been passed already; another is under consideration today. Up to this time we have certainly made a poor showing, and one which the taxpayers back home are not going to appreciate. The Congress has approved the Department of Labor and the Federal Security appropriations bill, H. R. 3709, for the year 1952. The committee recommended an appropriation of $2,051,937,140 for that agency, a reduction of a little better than 1 percent from the appropriation voted a year ago. Amendments shaved those figures slightly.

The committee reporting for the Interior Department did better but not good enough, in my opinion. Today we have before us another appropriation bill. Amendments providing for reductions from the amounts set up by the committee will be offered. It is my feeling that every amendment of this character which is wisely conceived should be approved. No one realizes better than I that this is not the most intelligent way to determine what these appropriations should be. But any appropriations committee which has not made material reductions from expenditures last year can expect such treatment. We have spoken for economy in government in and out of the Halls of Congress. It is high time that we begin to practice what we preach. Our people back home are not going to think kindly of those who acclaim their devotion to economy in government and vote another way on the floor of this House.

Let us look at increases in expenditures in some of our executive departments over a period of years:

Agency	1940	1949	1950
Department of Commerce	$75,116,535	$662,000,000	$863,082,852
Department of Interior	71,385,280	485,000,000	568,435,344
Department of Justice	50,813,162	126,000,000	131,290,804
Department of State	20,254,403	317,000,000	361,226,112
Department of Agriculture	1,409,315,301	----------	1,301,305,326

Much of the expense of the Federal Government has come about through a multiplication of bureaus. Mr. Lindsay Warren, Comptroller of the Currency, is authority for the statement:

> Congress can set up a bureau for the edification of three blind mice or for the rehabilitation of Humpty Dumpty, and within a year those who head the bureaus can come in with glowing accounts of their work.

Warren is the watchdog of the Treasury, and in speaking before a congressional inquiry he said:

> The present setup is a hodgepodge and crazy quilt of duplications, overlappings, inefficiencies, and inconsistencies with attendant extravagance. It is an ideal system for tax eaters. This unsegregated, sprawling crop of Government functions and functionaries cannot do the job the taxpayers are paying for unless someone makes only one or two bureaus where dozens grew before.

The Federal per capita tax load jumped from $14.43 annually in 1932 to $263.99 in 1948. In 1932 the Federal Government took only 21.9 percent of the tax dollar, whereas the share today is just a little under 75 percent. The tax collector takes today, in round figures, 1 dollar out of every 4 earned—25 cents for State and local governments and 75 cents for the National Government.

This money is used to finance an army of activities so vast that they defy enumeration. The services of the Federal Government are performed by an army of more than two and one-quarter million civilian employees. The Civil Service Bureau reports 10,994 employees in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Census Bureau gives the Indian population at the figure 333,969. That is, we have 1 Federal employee for every 30 In-

dians. Additional employees were added to the Federal payroll at the rate of 2,000 per day during the months of January and February of this year. Civilian employment increased 56,166 during the month of March, of which 28,000 were white-collar employees.

A review of the budgets for the four peacetime years—1946, 1947, 1948, and 1949—reveals that the expenditures during those four peacetime years were 177 billion dollars, or 10 billions more than were spent during 152 fiscal years beginning with the inauguration of George Washington in 1789 and ending with the start of rearmament for World War II in 1940.

This brief statement of expenditures on the part of the National Government is recited for the purpose of revealing the immensity of the problem we are analyzing. An awareness of the extent of the tax load the average individual carries is difficult to reach unless one has an adequate understanding of the total burden.

Now, who pays these taxes? For authority on this subject, we shall cite the President of the United States. In presenting his budget for the last fiscal year, the President stated that the Federal-tax dollar would be derived from the following sources of revenue:

Direct taxation on individuals	$0.43
Direct taxation on corporations	.28
Excise taxes (sales tax)	.19
Custom duties	.08
New taxes	.02
Total	1.00

Who pays individual taxes amounting to 43 cents of each dollar collected? Everyone who pays an income tax. Who pays sales taxes on theater seats, perfumes, jewelry, tobacco, and hundreds of other items which amount to 19 cents of every dollar collected? The public in general. Who pays custom duties in the end? They are a part of the increased cost of every item we buy which has passed through a custom house. Now, there is left corporation taxes which account for 28 cents of each dollar collected and new taxes amounting to 2 cents of each dollar. Those who buy the manufactured article and the men in the factory with the sweat of their brow meet the cost of corporate taxes, and the remaining new taxes we will, also, meet in one form or another; than can be depended upon.

These crushing burdens of taxation, if permitted to continue unchecked, will eventually undermine the stability of our country. In speaking on this subject, Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia, says:

> Taxes may conceivably bankrupt America and do exactly what the Communists want done to undermine American stability. Before there is a resort to force—

Says Senator ROBERTSON—

> we may expect an all-out communistic effort to wreck the democracies of the world financially.

Herbert Hoover said:

> Along this road of spending, the Government either takes over, which is socialism, or dictates institutional and economic life, which is fascism.

Let us quote from Senator HERBERT R. O'CONOR, of Maryland:

> The only possible way to avoid serious damage to our fiscal structure and possible complete collapse is to cut Government spending drastically.

Members of this Chamber have been quite vociferous at times in regard to the cutting of expenditures. It is time now to begin to practice what we preach. Let us cut the fat out of payrolls. Excessive civilian employment is the key to extravagance and inefficiency. The time to act is while these appropriations are being submitted to the Congress. I have not voted for most of the appropriation bills submitted thus far, and I shall continue to vote against them until I see a more serious attempt to economize in Government expenditures.

Let us not have politics as usual when we are dealing with the solvency of a Nation and a people overburdened with taxation. Let us not permit the baneful prophesies of Lenin to come true when he said:

> America will sometime spend itself into destruction.

And again when he said:

> The best way to promote a bloodless revolution is for the currency of a nation to commit suicide.

The destiny of our republic is in our hands as we vote these appropriations day by day. Let us support every amendment to this bill that is wisely conceived and productive of the results we are pledged to achieve.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

(Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of discussion of this piece of legislation today and the suggestion of rolling back prices, and price control.

I do want to compliment this Committee on Agricultural Appropriations on making a very substantial reduction in this bill. I furthermore want to commend them on the wisdom through the years they have acquired to be able to decide what is best in legislation for the encouragement of agriculture at the lowest possible cost to the Government. I think the country is fortunate in having men so devoted to their work and so well experienced in this subject as those who have brought this bill to the House, and I say this most sincerely.

I have always been interested in agriculture, having owned and operated farms most of my life, and I have been glad to note that the Congress of the United States has been able to initiate policies that has encouraged agriculture to develop to its high state of efficiency and production that we have in this country now.

Far be it from me or the Members of this Congress to take away the things that are necessary for greater production in agriculture in these critical times. Agriculture is actually the basis, the foundation of the economy of this country. We must never lose sight of that. Agriculture is manpowered and womanpowered by a group of millions of people who work longer hours and are willing to take more gambles on weather and prices than any other group of citizens in the United States today. They work, of course, for profit, but also for their love of their work. They work longer hours, earlier in the morning and later in the night time, with less complaining as to profits or pay than any other group of people.

I want to commend the committee on bringing in here a very adequate appropriation for the continued expansion and extension of rural electrification, for the farms of the people of America. I have always supported adequate appropriations for REA and will continue until light and power is available for all farm families that want it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I recall several times in the past 6 or 8 years when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] has come to me and urged me as a member of the subcommittee to do whatever could be done toward seeing to it that rural electrification became a reality, become completed, as soon as possible. I want to back up the gentleman on what he has just said as exhibiting his interest in that one thing which has meant so much to the farmers of the Midwest, in fact, all the farmers of America.

Mr. VURSELL. The gentleman is very kind, and I thank him sincerely. And may I say I know of no one in the Congress who has rendered a greater service to the farmers of the Nation than has the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

As I understand it, the committee has brought in a modest appropriation of $100,000,000 for rural electrification. That was the amount requested by the President in his budget. The committee has in fact doubled the amount requested in the budget. The committee has provided that REA can draw, when the Director can show need, another $100,000,000, so that they can enter into contracts when necessary for extensions as the money is needed and save money in the hope of beating the inflation gun and carry on this work.

I am also interested in the fact, and want to commend the committee on appropriating for soil conservation in this bill for technical and administrative services of roughly about $56,000,000. I think something like $276,000,000 was appropriated for soil conservation under the PMA, of which about 10 percent of that goes for administration in Washington, and down to the level of the county committeemen of the PMA.

That is money which is not wasted. It is money well invested. We need greater production in this country today as a break against inflation. The Government wants greater production on the part of the farmers. The farmer is willing to go out and answer that call and he will do the best he can, profits or not. It is up to the Congress to see that farmers get a square deal when you

talk about these rollbacks, whether it is rollbacks for the beef farmer, or of farmers anywhere along the line. The farmer will respond to the call of the Government for greater production. It is the responsibility of Congress in the future, as it has been in the past, to protect the great agricultural industry of this country. When we get the facts as the debate unfolds in the weeks ahead, this Congress in my judgment will protect this basic industry so necessary to the continued prosperity of the country and so necessary for the continued power to defend this country against the world, if that is necessary.

In my judgment you cannot get greater production of beef if you penalize the farmer and take care of everyone else on up to the butcher shop in New York and Chicago, and penalize none of them, but take it all out on the farmers who must produce this material wealth from the very beginning.

The price paid the farmer for his products when they leave the farm has little effect on high prices and the present inflation. Inflation is caused mainly by cost beginning with transportation and high wages for everyone who handles his products till they reach the merchant's shelf and are bought by the consumer.

The present proposed rollback of beef prices will not restrict the wage of anyone who handles the beef from the farmer. It will not take a penny away from the packer or the butcher who sells the meat. It only penalizes the farmer-producer.

You cannot get greater production of beef by rolling back the price the farmer gets which in many instance will cause him to operate at a loss. He will lose his incentive to produce. You will get less beef and put the black market operators back in business.

(Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, it is very possible that the orders issued do help the packers and processors, at least the big ones. It happens that in my district some of the little ones are being put out of business very rapidly by this order. If they are black-marketing it is going to be something, the like of which we have never seen. Some of the very finest of my small processors are just going to be finished in another month or two. Instead of making a little margin they are four or five thousand dollars in the hole every month and they cannot go on like that. They will have to shut down. Then what happens? Black-marketing and hides buried because they cannot be sold, and no hides going into the market, no byproducts available for medicinal purposes. We should bear in mind especially that we are using the byproducts of beef more and more in this field. I want to add my voice in protest to those that have gone out from the well of this House.

Mr. Chairman, I have another little matter that I want to bring before you because it is of quite another character. That is the contribution that our agricultural people make to some of the terrific problems with which other countries are faced. We have a point 4 agreement with Iran. Iran, I want to remind you, is right on the edge of some very serious trouble for you and me. Early in April those working in the point 4 program were notified by Iran that the locust problem was such that the locusts might absolutely ruin 130,000 acres of wheat, pistachio nuts, and various kinds of foodstuffs. They SOS'ed to the State Department and then what happened? The most thrillingly dramatic thing that you could possibly imagine.

Things began to move. Mrs. Shipley at the passport office had every single passport and every other necessary arrangement made within 24 hours. All the men got their inoculations within 24 hours.

The State Department made a contract with the United States Overseas Airlines for the flights and spraying operations. The Iranian Government agreed to fuel the spraying planes and feed and house the pilots and mechanics. The Department of Agriculture supplied the technical men. William R. Mabee, entomologist and pioneer in the use of planes for applying insecticides to field crops for the control of insects, directed the technical phases of the project. The new insecticide, aldrin, was flown to the Idlewild Airport from Denver. Two ounces of this mixed in solvent is enough to kill locusts covering an acre of ground.

They got those little planes rigged up inside of 6 days. In no time at all they were out all over this 130,000 acres. There were 2,000 acres where the eggs were. Those locusts, if they had gotten started, would not only have eaten up the 130,000 acres below the thirtieth parallel, but they would have continued right on up and destroyed practically every single bit of the food production areas in Iran. Because we had a perfectly fine agricultural man doing grasshopper extermination in our country from the air, we could send him over there almost overnight. He took a corps of experts with him, and the necessary pilots went over. I think that is a very thrilling story, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I agree with the gentlewoman that that is a very thrilling story, but who knows about it?

Mrs. BOLTON. I am telling you so that it will get out.

Mr. CANFIELD. The House did not know anything about it until today, and I wonder if the people of Iran know the details of that over there.

Mrs. BOLTON. Oh, yes; the people of Iran know about it well. There is no question about that. My hope is that the Members of this House will take the trouble to read this little discussion and will feel that perhaps there is great value in some of the things that point 4 makes possible through the various departments of our Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the housewife is deeply concerned about high prices. In the mobilization effort the Government is attempting to solve the problem of inflation, not only for the benefit of the consumer, but also to save tremendous sums in the purchase of war material. Price control is one of the methods suggested to solve this problem. In order to arrive at a correct solution, those agencies fixing the regulations with respect to commodity prices must understand the problems of the producers. Unless we completely change our form of government and have absolute government ownership or operation of industry, the producer must be placed in a position which permits him to continue his business.

The cattle business is operated by a comparatively small group of people. It is a business about which there is lack of understanding and knowledge. This was disclosed recently when the Office of Price Stabilization issued a roll-back order on the price of beef and placed the entire cost of the roll-back upon the cattle producers. I have received a number of letters from cattlemen at home, and I want to quote to you from these letters. Each includes facts concerning operation of the roll-back order with respect to his case, which would apply to the industry as a whole. The reading of these letters brings one inevitably to two conclusions: First, the roll-back order will impose a great loss upon the cattlemen; second, it will result in less beef for the consumer.

Excerpts from letters regarding price roll-back:

Cattle have been assessed for taxation based on the higher prices. Also a large number of cattle, including most of the 1951 calf crop, have been contracted for fall delivery at prices based on market prices of the past 90 days.

While the roll-back has disrupted the cattle industry and placed it in a state of confusion, there is little indication that the consumers will benefit in the future. More and more beef will end up in black markets which meat will cost the consumer more money than through regular channels.

My two sons and myself have over 400 head of Hereford cattle. Over 300 head of these are yearling calves most of which have been bought last fall, balance are cows and calves. We have been following the deferred feeding plan for several years. These calves are wintered well, put on grass May 1 and put in feed lot about August 1 for about 90 to 100 days on ground ear corn and protein feed.

No doubt you saw the order starting May 20 the roll-back will take off 10 percent, August 1, 4½ percent and October 1, 4½ percent, a total of 18 percent.

I wonder if that outfit in Washington thinks that we farmers and feeders will risk our corn, feed, and labor when we know we will get 18 to 20 percent less for our cattle when fattened? I note that the United States Department of Agriculture has asked the roll-back on live animals or cattle be abolished.

The entire bunch of cattle would average around $250 a head. So you can see what an investment they represent. The calves purchased last fall cost from 34 cents to 37 cents a pound. With the roll-back they would sell around 30 cents. So you can see what the roll-back would do to us. If these orders are put through we will have meat shortages, rationing, and black market and heavy losses to us farmers. They will discourage feeding and cripple the cattle industry and shorten the customer of meat. Labor is asking increase in wages and getting it and here roll-back on cattle prices against the farmer.

I doubt if my opinion with respect to livestock is of much value, but from the size of my notes at the bank covering my livestock operation I feel that I am justified in suggesting to you that the situation in the industry is indeed serious. I have a small herd of 40 stock cows and 120 head of yearling steers and heifers that are now enjoying our good Kansas grass. I would like to leave them all there and watch the yearlings grow into feeders that I can finish into good beef, but in view of what has occurred in Washington I am sure you can appreciate that that sort of a program entails too much risk to a fellow who is operating entirely on borrowed capital. I have no ideas as to how to curb inflation, but if increased production is one of the ways to bring about a decrease, the 19 percent roll-back in cattle prices certainly is not the answer. This is going to cause heavy losses and be a crippling blow to the food production effort.

I am one of hundreds who have stocked their pastures with high-priced cattle that we have had to pay for, and now know that if this unfair roll-back is enforced, we will probably lose money as well as the use of our grass for this season. We have already lost our wheat crop and if our cattle, also, lost money, we have little prospect for the year 1951. Our labor, feed, repairs, gasoline, and everything that we are forced to buy has gone up continually and is still going higher.

First, let me say that I think that finished cattle prices are too high. Second, the cattle-production cycle in Kansas is about 14 months, not 6, as the price regulator would have the public think. Third, if price ceilings were going to be used on cattle they are 6 months late.

Perhaps a question best sets up the situation. Suppose that you purchased 100 head of choice calves 400 to 600 pounds during the last 6 months. They would have cost $38 to $40 per 100. They are not ready to be slaughtered, and won't be until they are grazed this summer and then fed 90 days. This is the proven best practice in your State. How would you handle these cattle to keep from losing $7 to $10 per 100? Finished cattle that are nearly ready can be sold and the owner is O. K. But I would like to have your answer to the calves bought last fall and so far this year. This farmer that usually handles and feeds cattle buys them on an open, free, competitive market, as he has done for years. It's his farm program, his living and existence. Then he lives in a country where he can be put into 2 to 5 years poverty by a Government order. Why doesn't the Government roll back labor prices to last June levels? Labor prices have gone up as sharply as have beef prices. Farm machinery has gone up 10 to 20 percent since the Korean War. Why not roll it back?

We are going to be taking heavy losses on our beef production if the present plans are carried out. One, our beef producing plan, is a 1-year plan—our cattle were bought costing from $35 to $40 per hundredweight, now we have them on Kansas blue stem grass where they will pasture until October 1, then we put them in the dry lot, to be fed corn and they will go to market in December and January. By that time DiSalle says we shall take an 18-percent reduction, or about one-fifth loss—which would bust most of the cattle feeders in Kansas.

I admit, and you will too, that cattle are up to a point of ceiling control being necessary, but there should be a period where the feeders will be allowed to market their cattle at a fair margin of profit and still have a shirt on their backs. I honestly believe that if the order goes through as it is now written that 70 percent production cut-back in our community of feeding will result and that figure may be conservative. My father-in-law feeds around 1,000 cattle a year and his lots will be empty just as soon as these runs are over. Right now he has but 150 head that he is feeding and he intends to clean them out completely by May 30. Now he is by no means the largest feeder in our community, but it will give you an idea of just how serious this thing can become. Now here in Denton we can buy the processed ham for $1.30 per pound, yet we sent that same hog into St. Joe for killing and received but $20 per hundred or 20 cents per pound.

In my judgment the price roll-back on beef is not only discriminatory, but in direct violation of the law and the basic philosophy of price stabilization. Yesterday I questioned Charles Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization, about this situation. I want to quote to you my questions and Mr. Wilson's replies:

Mr. COLE. What is your conception of the responsibility of these agencies (Office of Price Stabilization, Wage Stabilization, etc.) with respect to the economy of the country, with respect to stabilization as against the freezing of prices and wages?

Mr. WILSON. Well, "freeze," I think, is an unfortunate term. Stabilization is the concept we have of their operation.

Mr. COLE. Does stabilization mean, therefore, as though we were on a scale and attempting to keep all the economy balanced?

Mr. WILSON. Well, yes, take into consideration all the factors and try to balance up, yes, that is right.

Mr. COLE. Then that means, does it not, that each segment of the economy still may maintain a profit system and may have a profit in its operation?

Mr. WILSON. I hope so.

Mr. COLE. Do you say that advisedly, you hope so?

Mr. WILSON. Yes. I will say I believe so. I believe it does. I do not believe we want to eliminate that.

Mr. COLE. As you envision your responsibility, it is then that you shall maintain with the economy, an operation so that each individual business—not each individual, let us say class of business, shall operate at a profit.

Mr. WILSON. That is right. Because what good would it do us to expend our national wealth at the rate we are expending it and come out of the period broke? I think we ought to envisage coming out of it with a strong economy, I hope.

Mr. COLE. I agree. In connection with CPR 22: I am not going to question you in detail about it, but I am using it as an overall question of the philosophy of the operation of your office.

The price regulation (CPR 22) is to assist manufacturers in connection with the roll-back of prices in the manufacturing of commodities.

This regulation provides that there shall be a roll-back, but in connection therewith a manufacturer may take into consideration his increased costs. That is based upon the philosophy that you have now.

But, Mr. WILSON, there was a roll-back order not long ago, issued by Mr. DiSalle, where the producers of meat were required to take a roll-back without any consideration whatsoever of their cost. They were charged, first, last, and always with that roll-back, without the slightest consideration of their increased costs.

This is contrary to your announced policy that prices should be "stabilized," not frozen. It is contrary to your announced policy that each class of business shall operate at a profit.

Mr. Chairman, the livestock industry does not want to be guaranteed a profit. It is perhaps the most competitive and independent business in the country today. They do insist, however, that they are entitled to fair treatment and that they are being discriminated against. They only ask that they be treated in the same manner accorded other groups. The roll-back order on the price of beef has caused, and will cause, thousands of head of cattle to be sold before they are fattened. Thus, the housewife will be faced with a shortage of beef, and the object of price control will be defeated.

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] such time as he may desire.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, within the last week, it has been brought out that Great Britain, and other countries, have been furnishing Communist China with rubber and other articles useful in war since China entered the war against United Nations forces in Korea.

The disclosure that 120,000 tons of raw rubber was shipped from Malaya to Red China in the 9 months ending in March has resulted in sharp and angry debate in the British Parliament.

Because of the fact that American casualties in Korea have reached a total of over sixty thousand, such trade between Communist China and foreign countries is clearly a matter of grave concern to all Americans.

The Congress of the United States must in conscience take action that will condemn and forbid any further shipment of materials, useful in war, to Communist China directly, or indirectly through Hong Kong, either by this country or by any other member of the United Nations whose military forces are now engaged in combat in Korea against the common enemy.

Natural rubber has been probably the most important material Red China has received from Great Britain, or from any other country, but it has not been the only war material the Chinese Reds have been receiving.

During 1950, Hong Kong received over 49,000 tons of rubber from Malaya, about twice as much as she received in the previous year. China, in 1950, received over 43,000 tons of rubber, five and one-half times as much as she got in 1949.

The increased importance of Hong Kong as a gateway for goods to China is common knowledge, and trade figures prove it. While between 1949 and last year, total exports from Hong Kong to all countries increased some 60 percent,

exports from Hong Kong to Red China increased some 150 percent—from $585,000,000 to $1,461,000,000.

In his testimony before the Senate committees last Thursday, General MacArthur, using a report of the American Consul General at Hong Kong as a basis, showed that about forty million dollars' worth of materials, including such strategic goods as railroad equipment, steel products, ties, and petroleum, entered China through Hong Kong in a period of 3 weeks, earlier this year.

The increase in shipments of rubber from Malaya to China either directly or indirectly was apparent in the February 1951 figures. These showed that in February over 10,000 tons of rubber were shipped to China and over 4,800 tons to Hong Kong.

Yet, in February, the British Minister of Colonial Affairs, in replying to criticisms of these shipments, said simply:

> It has not been decided that there should be general sanctions on all trade against Soviet Russia, China, and other countries behind the iron curtain. We are carrying on normal trade.

Since that time, on April 9, the British imposed controls on Malayan rubber exports, but, as the British periodical, the Economist, stated, "There is no way yet of telling how effective such controls will be."

From what Prime Minister Attlee has said in the past few days, we cannot expect Red China to be shut off completely from Malayan rubber. In his words to the House of Commons on May 3, "there cannot be an absolute prohibition to see that no rubber whatsoever gets to China."

There is strong reason to believe that the trade of the British and others is helping the Chinese Communists with other essential war goods than rubber. A censure motion filed in Parliament against the British Labor Government on May 4 accused the Government of having authorized or permitted not only the rubber shipments of 120,000 tons between July 1950 and March 1951, but also the shipment to China of 3,430 tons of iron and steel and manufactures thereof, $149,600 worth of vehicles, and other strategic materials, including electrical goods and apparatus and other machinery between January and March of this year.

In exchange for the goods useful in war, Red China has been careful about what she has exported. Hong Kong statistics show that the Chinese, while denying the western nations tin, antimony, and tungsten in any appreciable amounts, have been letting outside nations have increasing amounts of nonessentials, like tea and nuts, in exchange for the war materials they want.

In regard to United States exports, there has been in effect since last December, through controls of export licenses, an embargo on all shipments to Red China. While this has resulted in virtually a complete stoppage of United States exports to China, we have not banned exports to Hong Kong, as evidenced in the $1,500,000 worth of United States exports to that colony during January and February of this year.

Last Thursday, United Nations American Delegate Ernest Gross proposed an arms embargo against Communist China by the member countries of the United Nations.

And according to yesterday's newspapers the formal resolution to this end, introduced by the United States delegate yesterday at Lake Success will receive the backing of England and France.

Certainly this step is to be applauded. It does not in my opinion, however, go far enough. Certainly Hong Kong cannot be ignored as a vital source of Red China's war-making goods. Nor, as far as can be found out, does the resolution provide for any penalties for violation.

The final successful passage of such a resolution in the United Nations is only a possibility at best moreover, and there is certain to be powerful opposition to it.

And I do not think the Congress of the United States can stand by and wait for developments in the United Nations any more than our military forces in Korea can wait for such developments.

Consequently, as a positive attempt to ban all shipments of war goods to China and to Hong Kong either by the United States or any foreign country, I have today introduced a bill providing for an embargo on the shipment of all war material, within the limits of national security, from the United States to Communist China or to Hong Kong.

The bill makes it unlawful, punishable by a fine of $50,000 or imprisonment up to 5 years, or both, to export any war material from the United States to Communist China or Hong Kong unless, before such exportation, the President shall determine such exportation would be to the advantage of the security of the United States. It further provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall prepare and publish in the Federal Register and keep current a list of all articles, materials, and supplies the importation of which by Communist China would enhance its war-making potential.

The bill also attempts to curtail exportation of war materials to Communist China or Hong Kong from any foreign country by prohibiting American economic or financial assistance, except assistance granted under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act, to any foreign country which exports, or permits to be exported, such war materials to China or Hong Kong, unless before such exportation, the President of the United States shall determine that such exportation would be to the advantage of the collective security of all of the United Nations engaged in military and naval operations in and around Korea.

This bill also provides for a monthly report, based on official estimates, to be made by the State and Commerce Departments to the Congress on the origin, transshipment, quantities, and types of all such war materials entering Communist China and Hong Kong during the preceding month.

I hope that this House will take speedy and favorable action on this bill. I believe that its passage would prove to the world, that while Americans may have different ideas as to United States policy in the Far East, all of us are united in our determination to stop the "trade in blood" that has been going on.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes; the Democratic administration has been responsible for all this rubber going to China while we have always used three-quarters of it; and the reason for it is that they have upped the price. That is the truth, is it not?

Mr. KENNEDY. I may say to my good friend and colleague from Massachusetts that I was talking about shipments from Malaya, which is under British control, either directly to China or through Hong Kong.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. That is just what I am saying. We have stopped the exportation of anything to China, and England has upped it three or four times as much.

Mr. KENNEDY. Exactly.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am trying to point out to my friend from Massachusetts that this trade has been going on not only in rubber but in other valuable war materials; and the purpose of these remarks that I am making is to bring attention to a bill which I introduced today to try not only to restrict American trade through Hong Kong of possible strategic material but also to stop the shipment by any foreign country of any strategic material directly to China or through Hong Kong. That is the purpose of my remarks, and I am glad that my colleague from Massachusetts is heartily in favor of it.

Mr. NICHOLSON. That is right; I am glad the gentleman is bringing that out.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, may I take this time to advise the Members of Congress of a matter of vital importance to them and to their disabled constituents by reminding the membership that on tomorrow morning in the caucus room in the Old House Office Building at 10 o'clock there will be an exhibition of prosthetic appliances—arms and legs—by the men who have been working with them for some years. The men wearing the legs and arms will all be veterans of World War II and the Korean War. The membership, I know, will be amazed at what has been accomplished in a short time. This exhibition and demonstration will be put on by the National Research Advisory Committee that has done a great job. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] and myself have been greatly interested in this and we extend an invitation to all Members to attend and to the public. The public will be greatly interested because they later can buy arms and legs similar to those exhibited. Mem-

bers will not regret seeing this great exhibition but, on the contrary, will be highly pleased at what has been done for those who have been wounded by the guns of war, the matériel of destruction. My colleagues in appropriating for prosthetic appliance research should be happy that the money has been so effectively spent.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read down to line 6, page 1, of the bill.

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PROSTHETIC APPLIANCES DEMONSTRATION

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] and I have several times in the last 2 weeks called the attention of the Members to the demonstration to be held in the Old House Office caucus room on Thursday of this week, May 10. It is a demonstration of the latest types of artificial arms and legs, and will be carried on by amputee veterans of the Second World War and of the Korean campaign.

This demonstration should prove of particular interest when it is known that until 1944 virtually no improvements had been made in artificial limbs since probably the Civil War. The appliances were crude and primitive, and in many cases the wearer was subjected to cruel pain in being fitted with them. The full extent of the lack of development or improvement in artificial limbs was not realized until the thousands of veterans of World War II began streaming into our hospitals in this country needing replacements for their lost arms and legs. It was then discovered how impoverished we were to provide these young men with devices which would be of real assistance to them, rather than something hanging uselessly on them.

In the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses a subcommittee of the House Labor Committee was authorized by resolution to make a study of aid to the physically handicapped. I had the honor to be chairman of it in both instances. This committee made an exhaustive study of physical handicaps resulting from injury, war, and disease. The best professional people in their fields appeared before the committee, as did the handicapped themselves. I regret that at the beginning of the Eightieth Congress the matter was dropped and no legislation resulted. We did feel, however, that we had succeeded in directing public attention to our failure to provide proper treatment and training for the handicapped, particularly in cases of cerebral palsey and rheumatic heart, to the lack of employment opportunities for those with physical disabilities, and to the need for utilizing the knowledge we had obtained toward a positive program of assistance for our physically handicapped citizens.

In the course of its studies the committee looked into the special problems of the amputee, both civilian and military. We learned then how little had been done in the field of artificial limbs and what crude instruments were available. It was nothing short of pathetic to see our veterans appear before the committee attempting to make use of the prostheses which were then in vogue. This applied, as well, to the civilian amputee, many of whom appeared before the committee. Sensing that something was wrong in the manufacture of artificial arms and legs, the committee asked the Justice Department to make an investigation to determine whether there was a violation of the law. As a result of that investigation, the Department cited a number of artificial limb manufacturers, and they were subsequently convicted of violation of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act. Then the committee asked the Federal Trade Commission to call the manufacturers together for the purpose of drawing up a code of fair trade practices for the limb industry. I am glad to say that such a code was devised and has since been in effect. Following this, the Army, Navy, and Veterans' Administration began strenuous efforts in research and development, looking to the improvement of surgery, which is most important, as well as prostheses.

It was at this time that the Advisory Committee on Artificial Limbs was set up by Executive order in the National Research Council. Excellent work has been done by the Committee, particularly in conjunction with several manufacturing concerns, scientific laboratories, and colleges whose help was enlisted. Through a bill initiated by Congresswoman ROGERS, the Advisory Committee on Artificial Limbs has been receiving funds each year and its work has been carried steadily forward. About the same time General Hawley established an Advisory Committee to the Veterans' Administration on artificial arms and legs for veterans. This committee is still functioning under the able chairmanship of Col. Robert S. Allen, noted newspaper commentator and author. Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS and I are the members from the Congress. Excellent work has been done by the Advisory Committee in connection with the Veterans' Administration, and we are proud of the progress that has been made in the improvement of devices and services for amputee veterans. The Advisory Committee was instrumental in having the findings and development of Government research in the field of prostheses made available to the civilian population. While there are over 20,000 amputees resulting from the two World Wars and the Korean campaign, it is estimated that there are close to 300,000 amputees in the civilian population. It is plain, therefore, how important it is that this great number of civilian amputees should have the benefits of scientific advances which have been made at the taxpayers' expense. Happily, it is the case today.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no undertaking so productive of good results as these committees. I feel confident that with continued efforts and the same energy and intelligence that produced the remarkable change in artificial appliances we can look forward to even better prostheses than we have today. I have recited this brief history in order that the Members who visit the demonstration may be fully appreciative of what has been done and the difficulties encountered in bringing about correction of the conditions which prevailed prior to 1944.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I, too concur in the gentleman's statement. I went out to Forest Glen, Md., a few weeks ago and saw a preliminary exhibition. It is the most amazing thing I have ever seen, and I hope tomorrow morning there will be a real turnout of the Members to see what our Government, particularly this research laboratory, the only one of its kind in the world, is doing to help these amputees.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. They have done remarkable work.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

GEN. ALBERT C. WEDEMEYER: SOLDIER, STATESMAN, CITIZEN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it was with real regret that I read in the press of the request for retirement by Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, commanding general of the Sixth Army with headquarters at San Francisco. It is with a sense of deep personal loss that I view the request of General Wedemeyer because I feel that he has been one of the country's outstanding military tacticians and I know that in his retirement we will greatly miss him. His knowledge of Germany and China, in particular, have been of tremendous value to us, and his knowledge of the Far East and the world in general, based on his duties both in and outside of the country, will leave a void difficult to fill. I do not know what has prompted General Wedemeyer's decision to request retirement, but I do know that the Congress of the United States holds him in high esteem and has for him and

ble before the so-called Korean police action began, when we had 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 men unemployed on the 26th day of June 1950, and 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 men partially employed. However, as Mr. Sawyer said very soon after the Korean War started, "We certainly cured the unemployment situation." He seemed to be very proud of that. But, Mr. President, to me that is not the way to cure unemployment.

Under cover of war, under cover of an emergency, we are completing the job of creating free trade by dividing the markets of the United States with all the nations of the world, precluding from future employment the working men in this country who get from $8 to $10 and $12 a day, making them compete with the sweatshop labor of Europe and Asia, where the workers receive from 40 cents a day up to perhaps $2.50 or $3 as a maximum.

Mr. President, I want to say at this point that most foreign nations have the same machinery available now in their industries and the same technical assistance that we have in this country, so the labor cost alone is the item which affects production costs.

The House bill which has been reported out—H. R. 1612—extends the authority of the thoroughly discredited State Department for 2 years more. It continues that authority over the working men, the industries, and the investors of this country. As reported to the Senate by the Finance Committee, it extends the time for 2 years. The thoroughly discredited and exposed Secretary of State may at his discretion utterly destroy any group of working men and industries in this Nation. He may continue to select at his whim the industries which are to be destroyed and those which are to be preserved. He can rearrange the industrial map of the United States by the destruction of specific industries.

EFFECT OF TARIFF CUTS DELAYED EXCEPT ON MINES

Mr. President, the State Department has closed 75 percent of the mines of the Nation, by putting the $10-per-day miner out of work, and importing the mineral products of the 50-cents-per-day to $2-per-day miners in Europe and in Asia. I simply use minerals as an example. The same thing is true of textiles, of crockery, of precision instruments, and of chinaware, as well as of any one of 400 or 500 other products. The tariff cuts were just beginning to take effect when the so-called police action was started in Korea. As soon as we have peace again, the disastrous effect will again take hold of the economy of this country.

THE CONGRESS HAS BEEN DECEIVED

Mr. President, I wanted to call attention to the almost immediate move to increase the price of Chilean copper after the promises of how the cheaper copper and the more abundant copper would become available to the industries of the United States. What a great case was built up here for the suspension of the copper tax. I am very sure that, if the Senate of the United States had known and had been sure, when the distinguished Senator from Ohio and the junior Senator from Nevada called attention to the fact, that we were going to pay more for copper from a foreign country than we would pay to our own, higher cost producers, the Senate might have considered the bill more carefully. I have noticed many editorials to the effect that, we can outproduct anyone on account of our efficiency. There is no more efficiency in a copper mine in this country than there is in a copper mine in Chile, because the identical processes are used in Chile that are used here.

Had the Senate been fully convinced that the State Department was going to increase the price paid for Chilean copper and subject this country to the blackmail of a threat, or to a promise not to sell quite so much to a Soviet nation, all for the price of 3 cents a pound, the Senate would have rejected the copper bill. And this is not the end. There will be other concessions to foreign nations, concessions detrimental to our pride, to our self-esteem, and to our economy. Wait and see.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I was otherwise engaged in committee hearings last Thursday and did not have an opportunity to take the floor to add a comment upon the commemoration of Polish Constitution Day, the 3d of May.

We in America owe much to the spirit of freedom which was enshrined in the Polish Constitution and transplanted by Poland's sons and daughters to flourish in the climate of liberty which our own Constitution provides. The spirit of Polish freedom gave us the names of such men as Kosciusko and Pulaski, whose heroism is a part of our national tradition.

But America has not served well the spirit of Polish freedom. As parties to the infamous agreement at Yalta, we have done much to extinguish the flame of freedom in Poland and to reduce a great nation and people to bondage.

We can rectify some of that by denouncing the errors of Yalta and by rededicating ourselves to polices which will yet see men who wish to be free, living in freedom.

We can and we must keep faith with the Polish people, whose sense of liberty and justice was embodied in their own great constitution, and from whom our own heritage of freedom has derived such great inspiration and tangible support.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon, on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 14, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 10 (legislative day of May 2), 1951:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Heyward G. Hill, of Louisiana.
Paul W. Meyer, of Colorado.
Edward D. McLaughlin, of Arkansas, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.
Robert E. Ward, Jr., of South Carolina, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a consul general of the United States of America.
Robin E. Steussy, of Wisconsin, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Walter E. Kneeland, of Texas.
Joseph H. Rogatnick, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Arthur Doak Barnett, of New York.
Philip J. Conley, of Maine.
Leo S. Disher, Jr., of North Carolina.
Robert W. Ehrman, of the District of Columbia.
Archibald B. Roosevelt, Jr., of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Peter J. C. Adam, of New Jersey.
Wilson P. Dizard, Jr., of New York.
Robert W. Kerwin, of Missouri.
Glenn Lee Smith, of California.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Robert G. Caldwell, of Massachusetts.
Herbert Cerwin, of California.
Bruce Buttles, of Pennsylvania.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following-named commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the rank indicated:

To be Assistant Director with rank of rear admiral

Robert W. Knox, effective June 1, 1951.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 10 (legislative day of May 2), 1951:

IN THE ARMY

Lt. Gen. Matthew Bunker Ridgway, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), for appointment as commander in chief, Far East, with the rank of general and as general in the Army of the United States.

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, MAY 10, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whom our fathers trusted and who bequeathed to us the rich heritage of a strong faith, make us daily more sensitive to Thy will and more obedient to Thy will.

May our faith be equal to the perilous times in which we are living and may we be loyal partners with all who are engaged in the difficult task of establishing Thy kingdom of peace on this earth.

Grant that we may have the courage to believe that all things will work together for our good if we love Thee. May we be confident that the day is coming when Thy promises shall be fulfilled and men and nations shall walk together on the highways of brotherhood and good will.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 54]

Adair	Gossett	Murray, Wis.
Armstrong	Granger	Patman
Bailey	Gwinn	Powell
Baring	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Price
Barrett	Hall, Leonard W.	Prouty
Battle	Harden	Reece, Tenn.
Belcher	Hébert	Regan
Blatnik	Hedrick	Richards
Buckley	Holifield	Rogers, Mass.
Burnside	Irving	Roosevelt
Byrne, N. Y.	Jackson, Wash.	Sadlak
Carlyle	Jenison	Saylor
Celler	Kersten, Wis.	Scott, Hugh D. Jr.
Crosser	King	Shafer
Dawson	Latham	Short
Dingell	Magee	Sieminski
Dorn	Miller, Calif.	Taylor
Fallon	Miller, N. Y.	Velde
Fogarty	Morrison	Vinson
Fugate	Murphy	Vorys
Gavin		Wood, Ga.
Gillette		
Gordon		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 364 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3973, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had completed reading the first paragraph. If there are no amendments to that paragraph, the Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the act establishing the Bureau of Agricultural Economics (7. U. S. C. 411) and related acts, as follows:

Economic investigations: For conducting investigations and for acquiring and diffusing useful information among the people of the United States, relative to agricultural production, distribution, land utilization, and conservation in their broadest aspects, including farm management and practice, utilization of farm and food products, purchasing of farm supplies, farm population and rural life, farm labor, farm finance, insurance and taxation, adjustments in production to probable demand for the different farm and food products; land ownership and values, costs, prices and income in their relation to agriculture, including causes for their variations and trends, $2,150,000: *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated or made available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics under the heading "Economic investigations" shall be used for State and county land-use planning, for conducting cultural surveys, or for the maintenance of regional offices.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: On page 3, line 19, strike out "$2,150,000" and insert "$2,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield ?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, I would like at this time to pay tribute to a young constituent and personal friend of mine, Lt. Louis V. Genuario, of Norwalk, Conn., a West Point appointee of former Congresswoman Clare Boothe Luce, and a man whom this Nation may well regard with pride.

Last Saturday Lieutenant Genuario received the Silver Star for gallantry in action.

He entered the Korean War as a veteran despite the fact that he is but 25 years old. Lieutenant Genuario served in the Air Force in China during World War II and upon his discharge entered West Point. Fresh out of West Point, he landed in Korea on September 1, and 11 days thereafter he single-handedly fought off an enemy rush, prevented a break-through and killed at least 100 men with hand grenades and an automatic rifle without regard for personal danger.

Eleven days after this marvelous feat, for which Lieutenant Genuario was awarded the Silver Star, the young officer was wounded while leading his platoon in an attack on a hill near the town of Am-Sin.

Lieutenant Genuario has been encased in a cast from the waist down ever since. He is recuperating at St. Albans Naval Hospital, and it is his fervent hope that he will soon be recalled for active service.

Such men as Lieutenant Genuario truly are representative of the finest of American manhood. While we are blessed with leaders such as he to carry the standard of freedom in this war-tortured world, we cannot help but gain eventual victory.

The complete text of the citation awarded to Lt. Louis V. Genuario for his high courage is as follows:

HEADQUARTERS SECOND INFANTRY DIVISION,
APO 248 c/o POSTMASTER,
San Francisco, Calif., October 18, 1950.

General Orders No. 70.

Section II

Award of the Silver Star: By direction of the President, under the provisions of the act of Congress approved July 9, 1918 (WD Bul. 43, 1918), and pursuant to authority contained in AR 600-45, the Silver Star for gallantry in action is awarded to the following-named officer:

Second Lt. Louis V. Genuario, 062696, Infantry, United States Army, a member of Company G, Thirty-eighth Infantry Regiment, Second Infantry Division, displayed gallantry in action against an armed enemy on September 12, 1950, in the vicinity of Am-Sin, Korea. On the afternoon of September 12, 1950, Lieutenant Genuario, a rifle platoon leader, was assigned the mission of utilizing his platoon as a holding force in tactics involving encirclement and ambush of a superior number of enemy troops. When the primary stages of the mission had been accomplished and the initial attack launched the platoon received the brunt of the enemy's attempt to escape the encirclement. When the success of the mission was threatened due to a weakening of our line Lieutenant Genuario, with complete disregard for his own personal

safety, charged the enemy positions with hand grenades and automatic weapons fire. An enemy breakthrough was averted and approximately 100 enemies were annihilated. His gallant action on this occasion reflects great credit upon himself and the Armed Forces of the United States. Entered the military service from Connecticut.

By command of Major General Keiser:

GERALD G. EPLEY,
Colonel, GSC, Chief of Staff.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD with reference to a bill I have introduced giving the veterans of the present conflict the same benefits as the veterans of World War II.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment occurs in line 19, page 3 of the bill, and if adopted would reduce the item from $2,150,000 to $2,000,000. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics has two major lines of work. The one which in my opinion is most valuable as far as agriculture is concerned is that of assembling crop and livestock estimates. The subcommittee has recognized the good work of this particular division and the need for it, and has allowed, as you will note on line 11, page 4, approximately the full budget estimate, reducing the request by only $16,000. I am in full agreement with that section of the subcommittee's action.

However, I cannot agree that we should spend $2,150,000 on the more or less theoretical and nebulous end of the work of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics pertaining to economic investigations. The subcommittee did take away from the estimates given by the Budget for this item the sum of $379,000 and allowed $2,150,000. The attitude of the subcommittee, Mr. Chairman, in making this $379,000 reduction is well illustrated by the comments of our chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. If you will turn to page 14 of the hearings, you will notice that in referring to the economic investigations, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] said:

All that information is very worthwhile, but it strikes me that you might give a little thought as to whether this is an abnormal period, and whether you should not wait in doing some of this sort of work.

Now, Mr. WHITTEN's remarks well illustrate the attitude of the minds of the members of the subcommittee as to the need for the expenditure of this much money for investigations into the economic aspects of agriculture at this time. The subcommittee's reaction, by the way, is reflected in our reduction of $379,000 below the amount requested for 1952.

All my amendment does is to further decrease that particular appropriation by $150,000. It would still leave those people for this work $2,000,000 and with which to make investigations and studies, based on data which they gather under the other portion of this appropriation, for which we allow them $2,850,000.

Mr. Chairman, $2,000,000 is a lot of money. It will hire approximately 400 people, at the least. Surely this should be sufficient personnel to analyze the results of the statistical data gathered by the further expenditure of another $2,850,000.

I am offering this amendment simply because I believe that we can here save $150,000 without harming agriculture in the least and without doing anybody anything but good at this time. If we must spend this $150,000, let me suggest to you a place in this bill where we could well add with advantage to what has been allotted by the subcommittee. It could be much better allocated, for example, for research into the development of new strains of rust-resistant grains. Do you Members know that in this past year 1951 we lost at least $30,000,000 in these United States because of the occurrence of that new race of rust known as 15–B. That is where I would like to see a part of this $150,000 expended and at least $50,000 of it should be definitely earmarked in this bill for that purpose. It is suggested in the report that the Department of Agriculture should utilize $50,000, but that is by no means mandatory. Just yesterday, I noticed in the press that the oat crop in certain sections this spring is already suffering the results of this new strain of rust and deteriorating rapidly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. It there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. When we talk about our feed grains, our wheat, our oats, our barley, our rye, our corn, we are talking about something worth five or six thousand million dollars a year to the people of America, five or six billions. Is it not penny-wise and pound-foolish not to place in this bill at least $150,000 for this purpose? Let us develop new strains of wheat, new varieties of wheat, barley, rye, and oats to withstand this threat to our food production.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, I am suggesting that we save $150,000 at this point and utilize the money where it will bring back worthwhile results. The Department should get down to brass tacks and develop new strains of wheat and grain to obviate another loss of $30,000,000 such as happened this last spring in our food grain production.

Mr. Chairman, to conclude, please remember that when you do vote for my amendment to save this $150,000 we are giving to the crop and livestock reporting portion in this bill every dime, practically, that they asked for. Mr. Wells is doing a good job in that particular division. We want to give him all the money, needed for that work, and we have; so do not think for a minute that I am objecting to that part of it; it is at the expense of this item, "Economic investigation," which is far too theoretical sometimes to be of much help to agriculture, and out of which I am trying to save this $150,000, Mr. Chairman. With this I leave it to the good judgment of the Members of the House as to whether or not it should be done.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the distingnished gentleman from Minnesota who just preceded me is vitally interested in agriculture and one of the finest Members of the House of Representatives, but his argument that you just heard points out one of the problems that we have on this committee. Not a single witness who came before our committee could see how a cut could be made in the things in which he was interested. On the other hand, every one was willing to cut those things that were across the hill. When you sit on a committee and try to balance out that kind of thing you can imagine the problems that develop.

My friend from Minnesota is right in describing this problem in regard to wheat rust. He comes from that area and I appreciate his point of view. But this is just one example of what we have clear across the Nation. After month-long hearings we do our best to provide for the needs that are presented to us. Incidentally, we were not give the benefit of my friend's opinion in the subcommittee or in the full committee on this matter now under consideration. His objection is presented here on the floor, where it will get in the papers. But that is not the basis on which we should act in times when we are trying to get increased production from agriculture.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman knows that I reserved all of my rights on each and every item in the bill. I stated that I wanted to be in an open frame of mind so as to not preclude future consideration of amendments. The gentleman, I think, will agree that is a correct statement.

Mr. WHITTEN. I certainly will agree. But it is most unusual for a man with as fine a mind as the gentleman has to sit on a committee for 3 months listening to testimony and then find it necessary to reserve on every item while marking up the bill in the subcommittee. I should think a man would have his mind made up on some of it. But he is within his rights and I have no criticism to make. This item involves work under the activity "economic investigations." The gentleman says "I am in favor of keeping these records on crop and livestock estimates." Why do you keep these records on crop and livestock estimates? So that through these economic investigations committees of Congress and officials of

the Government can use the data to arrive at conclusions and to determine parity and to determine how much material should be set aside for fertilizer, for farm machinery and so forth. Why get up all this data if you are not going to use it? The purpose of spending the money that the gentleman says we should spend is to get this data together. Then you have to analyze it and put it together to determine what the crop outlook is. How are you going to determine how much wheat under the International Wheat Agreement you can send abroad unless you have somebody to compile and put together this data? How are you going to determine this India grain loan unless you have some idea how much grain you have?

I want to call your attention to the fact that the Department of Agriculture has asked the farmers of this country to increase production by 21,600,000 acres of land. Where are you going to get the figures to determine how much increase you should have?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman full well knows that there are $2,000,000 left in the bill for the purpose of analyzing those figures. The gentleman speaks as if the gentleman from Minnesota is endeavoring to strike out the entire $2,150,000. Let us get down to earth. We still leave them $2,000,000, and I still insist that is an awful lot of money.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is a lot of money. But the gentleman's amendment reminds me of the time when I was practicing law. I used to try lawsuits against a lawyer who represented a number of insurance companies, and he always found fault with the cost bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the genleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, as I stated, this lawyer always found fault with the cost bill which, of course, his client had to pay. On one occasion I had settled a lawsuit with this lawyer, we had the cost bill, and he was going over it with the clerk. He came down a certain item in the cost bill and this lawyer said, "Charlie, what in the world have you got this item in there for?" And the clerk said, "Mr. Brown, I knew you were going to question something, so I put that in there so I could take it out when you did."

Mr. Chairman, this committee sat for 3 months and we arrived at a general agreement. My friend did reserve his rights on each and every item in the bill. But he did not offer any amendments in committee that were not adopted. He is certainly within his rights. I cannot say he is wrong. I am just telling you the situation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman. will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not think the statement I did not offer any amendments which were not agreed to is quite correct.

Mr. WHITTEN. Could the gentleman repeat a single one that he offered which was turned down?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If the gentleman will recall, I tried hard to get that little additional money for a study of these new strains of wheat. The gentleman stated he would put in the report the suggestion to the Department that $50,000 be expended for this purpose. That is not agreeing to my amendment by any means.

Mr. WHITTEN. I meant any amendment the gentleman offered to reduce appropriations. Of course, the gentleman wanted to look better to his district, which is to his credit. He represents his district and I do not object to his looking after it. But this bill is supposed to look after agriculture on a Nation-wide basis. I know it is popular today to offer amendments on the floor and have the opportunity to say later on "I voted for every cut that was offered." I want to point out, however, that the amounts in this bill, as reported to you, represent a bigger reduction under last year than the amounts finally approved by this body on any bill considered thus far this year.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman knows full well that there is not a member of our subcommittee who looks after these things from a sectional point of view. If I did, I might question the over $1,000,000 that we gave to your part of the country to take care of the pink boll worm. I did not offer any amendment to it, because I think that is a good, worth while proposition, and I do not think the gentleman should even insinuate here that the gentleman from Minnesota is looking at it from a sectional viewpoint. Very little wheat is grown in my congressional district.

Mr. WHITTEN. I said the gentleman should look after his district. He just stated he wanted to increase the amount of money for new strains of wheat. He acted properly; there is no criticism of that. When you speak of this pink boll worm that affects cotton, the Government put up one-tenth of the amount of money in that control program. They put up 100 percent for barberry control in the gentleman's area. There are different reasons for it, and certainly it is our desire to be fair and reasonable. But I do want to make the situation clear as these small amendments are offered that you are taking something where the committee in its best judgment has reduced as much as we think we justifiably can. I am talking of the joint judgment of the committee. I think the gentleman did reserve his rights on all items, and I make no criticism of it. But, this bill is reduced now as it comes to you more than any other bill has been cut so far this year after you got through with it. I think the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman, of course, knows that one-half of the savings effected in this bill are as the result of what we are taking away in payments to the farmers of the Nation. We have removed, I think, $26,000,000 from the Soil Conservation, and if it were not for that we would show about 6 percent reduction instead of 11 or 12 that some people think.

Mr. WHITTEN. If you exempt each cut that we made, we did not cut it any, but in the aggregate, we cut it more than any bill that has been passed by the House this year. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this amendment. It is an amendment that seeks to save money.

Mr. Chairman, it has been my purpose to try to economize by cutting down all possible expenditures.

Recently I appeared before this House and spoke on the subject that the Government is spending entirely too much money. I also claimed that the Government is giving away too much money. And now for a few minutes I want to show that the Government is lending too much money.

The serious result of the Government's reckless financial programs is the constant increase of the already monumental national debt. The interest on the national debt is $5,700,000,000 a year. This is over a billion dollars a year more than the total cost of the Government when Franklin D. Roosevelt was first elected.

These serious financial situations are constantly before the Ways and Means Committee, which has the duty of preparing legislation to meet the terrific Government expenditures. The committee has been holding daily meetings for more than 3 months considering another big tax bill. The people in all walks of life are worried about this tax bill, for they feel that they are already taxed to death. The people are constantly complaining about the terribly high cost of living, much of which is due to taxes of many different kinds. Everything the people buy carries many hidden taxes.

Personal income taxes are already too high but the administration is demanding that they be increased drastically. The taxes on corporations have been increasing gradually during the past few years and now it is proposed to increase them until many small corporations will be forced out of business.

Heavy increased taxes are threatened on automobiles and gasoline. Also on jewelry, candy, cosmetics, freezers, refrigerators, cigarettes and many other

commodities. Why all these taxes? Mr. Chairman, if the Government would stop its reckless spending and its unreasonable give-away programs and its wild lending we would reduce the threats of inflation and would soon be able to live within our income and to reduce our big debt.

It is not an inherent right of the Government to go into the business of lending money. It should not do so except in cases where the safety of the Republic is in jeopardy. It has only been a few years since the Government went into the money-lending business. Up to about 20 years ago I think we had only entered into one lending venture. But since then the loans have been numerous and stupendous. The only limit seems to be the patience of the people.

The greatest experiment was the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. This organization was formed for a good purpose but the New Deal blight ruined it and recent scandalous disclosures have made it imperative that the RFC be dissolved. These men who are among the most qualified to speak on the subject, former President Herbert Hoover, former RFC Chairman Jesse Jones and Marriner Eccles of the Federal Reserve Board, vigorously and positively support my view that the RFC has outlived its usefulness and should be dissolved.

Practically all the money the Government gets comes from the people through taxes. If Washington needs money so badly for the war effort, why is it planning to advance more than $2 billion in Government loans that have a very questionable relationship to the defense effort? During the next fiscal year, these nonessential loans are going to be paid out to farmers, businessmen, homeowners, and others at the rate of almost $6 million a day, every day of the year, including Sundays and holidays. And even in these days of high prices and huge expenditures, $6 million a day will buy a lot of guns, bullets, tanks, and planes for our Armed Forces.

Then why is this $2,000,000,000 going into such Government loans instead of going into the defense effort? That, it seems to me, raises a more basic question: Why is the Government in the lending business at all? If a loan is sound, it can usually be arranged through private credit channels, particularly in times like these when money is plentiful. And if a loan is unsound, there is no reason why the taxpayers of the Nation should be forced to take the risks and losses—even if it means fewer mink coats in Washington.

Two years ago the Hoover Commission recommended that the Government get out of the direct lending business. The Commission warned that direct lending by the Government "opens up dangerous possibilities of waste and favoritism" and "invites political and private pressure, or even corruption." The headlines of the last few weeks show how right the Hoover Commission was. I might point out here that this opinion of the Commission was not quite unanimous. Among the three dissenters was Dean Acheson, who then, as so many times since, showed his lack of both perception and foresight.

But even if there were no political corruption, even if the entire lending program was conducted on a sound basis, this is not the time for lavish Government loans. It would be bad enough if the lending program merely took $2,000,000,000 out of defense and put it into nonessentials. What is even worse is that the $2,000,000,000 in loans will actually compete with the defense effort and make our preparedness program that much more difficult.

How? In two ways. First, the "consumer" loans to farmers, homeowners and other individuals put more money into the hands of consumers to compete for a rapidly lessening supply of civilian goods available to them. The result: increased demand in the face of a declining supply—higher prices—more inflation. It was to avoid such economic folly that the Government slapped heavy restrictions on private loans. Are Government loans any less inflationary?

Second, "producer" loans which put millions into the hands of manufacturers, would help them compete with defense industries for scarce materials and scarcer manpower. Result: existing shortages would be aggravated, prices and wages would be forced even higher.

And all this fails to take into account the additional inflationary effect of the huge program of loan guarantees that the President is planning for next year—encouraging private lending to the extent of almost $9,000,000,000.

Only a small part of the $2,000,000,000 that the President wants to lend next year will go into defense production, and a still smaller part represents loans already committed. But experts have figured that if Uncle Sam would cut his lending activities to the bone, his budget and our tax bill could be reduced by about $1,500,000,000 during 1952. And if, in addition, Uncle Sam started selling some of the mortgages and other notes he now holds, he could save at least another billion dollars.

That means that with one step, Uncle Sam could get out of the lending business, remove temptation from his loan assistants, help the defense effort, and save the taxpayers $2,500,000,000. I think it is worth trying.

In considering the President's proposal for the largest Federal spending program in our peacetime history, it seems to me the most important consideration is the horrible thought that we can lose our freedom and our way of life without ever having a bomb dropped on us from a Russian plane.

Inflation is not merely a nuisance or a disagreeable condition with which we are forced to live—inflation is a threat to our very existence—a threat almost as dangerous and at least as effective as the military might of the Soviet aggressors.

And one of the surest ways to bring on a runaway inflation is through the medium of Government loans. In fact, inflation is the reason for the existence of Government lending programs, which got their greatest impetus during the thirties in an effort to inflate a depressed economy. But now we are not faced with a depressed economy that needs the pump priming of Federal loans. Now we are faced with a major preparedness program that demends every available dollar of taxpayer's money.

Mr. Chairman, we are giving away entirely too much money.

We are lending entirely too much money.

We are spending entirely too much money.

We are taxed entirely too much money.

The Truman administration has failed the American people. The Nation is divided and the people are worried. The only hope for the people and the country is in the Republican Party. The Republican Party must assume the responsibility. Now is the time.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in rising to oppose this amendment, I want to congratulate this committee on the fine work that has been done. I think if the Members of the House will read the second paragraph of this report, they will have a profound admiration for the fine work done by the committee. I do not know of any appropriation bill that has come before the House that has evidenced greater study and greater consideration by the committee. On this particular amendment that has been offered, it would seem that the committee, in cutting out more than $400,000, has gone as far as we can afford to go. It would also appear to me that the gentleman who has offered this amendment has placed himself in a position of attempting to tell this House that his judgment is far superior to that of the collective judgment of his committee, which I think has done an admirable job. I think the gentleman from Mississippi, as chairman of this subcommittee, has convinced this House that he not only believes in economy, but that he is practicing economy all over the Nation and let the chips fall where they may. In view of the fine work this committee has done and the great reduction that it has made in this bill, I think that the least the membership of the House can do today is to go on record and support the majority views of that committee which has given great study and know whereof they speak, and which has not been selfish in any of its demands. I hope that this amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 58, noes 53.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WHITTEN and Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 101, noes 64.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

For necessary expenses of the Office of Administrator, including travel and subsistence expenses of advisory committees authorized by title III of the act of August

14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 1628–1629), and the maintenance, operation, and furnishing of facilities and services at the Agricultural Research Center, $560,000: *Provided*, That the appropriation current at the time services are rendered may be reimbursed (by advance credits or reimbursements based on estimated or actual charges) from applicable appropriations, to cover the charges, including handling and other related services, for equipment rentals (including depreciation, maintenance, and repairs); for services, supplies, equipment, and material furnished: *Provided further*, That of the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research Administration, not to exceed $15,000 shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further*, That the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research Administration shall be available for the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and improvements: *Provided, however*, That unless otherwise provided, the cost of constructing any one building (excepting headhouses connecting greenhouses and experimental farm houses) shall not exceed $5,000, the total amount for construction of buildings costing more than $2,500 each shall be within the limits of the estimates submitted and approved therefor, and the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed $2,500 or 2 percent of the cost of the building as certified by the Research Administrator, whichever is greater: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 7 per centum of the funds of any research appropriation of the Agricultural Research Administration, including the appropriation for the Office of the Administrator, may be transferred by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary, to any other such research appropriation in order to provide for a more effective research program: *Provided, however*, That no appropriation may be increased more than 7 percent by such transfers.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on yesterday, and I hope the membership was here and listening, my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], gave you quite a discourse on the destruction that the spruce bark beetle has been inflicting on our forests. I think it is interesting to note one or two of the high points in the address of the gentleman from Colorado. No. 1, he said something like this, which is quite interesting:

> Sixty percent of the total area of his district, which in its total size is almost as large as the entire State of New York, is owned by the Federal Government.

That is what the gentleman said. But let us put it on more personal terms. Let us say it is owned by the people of these United States.

That is important. Then he made another statement, which you should remember:

> The area of the timberland already destroyed by these bugs in his district is as large as the State of Rhode Island.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD following the remarks of the gentleman from Colorado.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, it is impossible for the Members of the House to understand the size and the gigantic proportions of some of these Western States and the forest lands in those States that are still ours. They do not belong to the States and they do not pay one single dime of State taxes. So I took occasion and made the effort to find out something about our States of the West. I noticed this little remark:

> Ninety percent of the Federal land, all the land that you own, as the United States of America, lies in 11 Western States.

I am going to detail those States to you because I think you should know what percentage of those States belong to you and me as legislators for the United States of America. Then I am sure the address of the gentleman from Colorado would have made more of an impression on the House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. We expended $125,000,000 to stamp out the hoof-and-mouth disease in Mexico, and that was done in the interest of private property and the cattle industry. I have been willing to vote twice that amount to protect that industry from the hoof-and-mouth disease. But here we have a forest which belongs to the people of the United States which is public property and yet we hesitate to expend $3,000,000 to keep those forest lands from being infested by this spruce bark beetle in the Rocky Mountains. We do not hesitate to spend money to prevent and fight forest fires, yet we hesitate to spend $3,000,000 to protect the forests from destruction by the spruce bark beetle, with the dead trees so destroyed increasing the hazard of fires. It does not make very good sense to me. It seems like false economy.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman knows the position of the committee. I wish the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] would correct me if I am wrong.

In the first place, we have not sold more than $700,000 worth of timber over the last 10 years. Is that not correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is correct.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In the second place, you cannot get any income from that particular area unless the Government is willing to go in and build a $20,000,000 plant and utilize it to provide material for newsprint. I will obtain the gentleman more time; but I think we ought to consider this question quite thoroughly. In the second place, the company which is advocating the construction of that particular plant is a large company, the Electric Bond & Share Co. They have a lot of finances and backing. Yet they are only willing, through their subsidiary, to risk $2,000,000 on a $20,000,000 plant. If they had more confidence in the ultimate success of this particular proposition, they should be willing to put up the entire $20,000,000 rather than come to the Government and ask the taxpayers of America to put up that plant.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I just wanted to show the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] that we are not acting on this in an arbitrary manner. We have gone into this very thoroughly. We cannot see the reason to dump many millions of dollars into this program when the value of the timber is not there, from all that we can learn. If you can convince the House to the contrary, I will help you in securing whatever time is necessary.

Mr. HILL. If the gentleman will give me time, I could certainly convince him. First, I will yield to the gentleman from California and then I will answer the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PHILLIPS. As I understand the points made by the gentleman from Colorado, they are, first, that these lands are federally owned and sometimes they are in excess of one-third of the land of an entire State; second, that the preservation of our forests is not alone for the preservation and sale of timber, but is also for the preservation of the topsoil and water; and, finally, what the gentleman from Colorado wants is some sort of determination of policy on the part of the United States so that we will not appropriate one year and not appropriate the next year, or appropriate a little instead of the right amount.

Mr. HILL. Exactly. I am glad to answer the gentleman from Minnesota. Let me show you how flat his argument falls. There are absolutely no facts to bear out any such statement. First of all, here in an area as large as the State of Rhode Island did grow fine, green, precious trees and underbrush; wonderful cover for a mountain area. Now, the gentleman says that because we have no money we are not only willing to have it totally and completely destroyed, but we are willing to let the water wash the soil away and fire to destroy that timber until it will be black, bleak waste of mountain terrain.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. What I am telling the gentleman is true. You say because we cannot sell any timber let us ruin the watershed.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. There is nothing to prevent private industry, even if we do not go ahead with the program,

from going in there. Why is it that the people of Colorado do not contribute a dollar to this work and thus fail to exhibit any real interest in this program.

Mr. HILL. The people of Colorado cannot even go on the land unless they get a permit from the Government. It is our land; we legislate for it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. They have not put up a dollar for this work. If it was in the State of Minnesota, certainly the State legislature would show some interest.

Mr. HILL. Certainly they would not put up a dime unless the Federal Government agreed to let them go in on the land and protect it. Right in this bill you propose to help cotton, and that is entirely private industry. You forget your relationship here.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ABBITT. I want to commend the gentleman for his stand on this question of control of insects; also his colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL]. I hope the gentleman will proceed and that additional time will be given him to explain the matter fully, for I think he is making a very valuable contribution.

Mr. HILL. If sufficient time is given me I should like to go further and I will show how much land the Federal Government has in each of these States. The reason I am making this talk is not to offer an amendment, but we in this House the other day knocked out an item in the deficiency appropriation bill we had under consideration, a $345,000 item to continue the beetle-bark extermination program that we had already started. We knocked it out and the chairman of the subcommittee not only said we should knock it out but that we should write it off.

Tell me what kind of legislation that is; you answer that question.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Aside from all that has been said thus far is it not a fact that this is the greatest reservoir of great virgin timber in the United States?

Mr. HILL. Of course it is. It is not a question of selling the mountains of the United States to some commercial company to make paper; we are building for the future, for the boys and girls who will come after us. You can replace any forest in the United States in 160 years, but what is the idea, tell me, of destroying it?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. If I yield I shall have to have three or four more minutes. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman from Minnesota said to let the legislature of your State and mine do something about it. I should like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota if he would be willing to turn these lands over to the States of New Mexico and Colorado?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Yes; I would.

Mr. HILL. It is all right for the gentleman to say so but he knows this House simply would not think of doing such a thing; it would not let us get hold of these lands.

Very few people can realize or visualize the vastness of this great western area. I venture to say—I have not had a chance to look it up—but I venture to say that the Federal Government has more land in these Western States than the whole United States had in the Original Thirteen Colonies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado may proceed for five additional minutes. I wish to ask him to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. This happens to be one item I took reservations on. I do feel that the House should consider that one of our great problems in the United States stems from the watersheds that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] is talking about now, and it involves a little civil war that is going on down in the southwest part of the United States between Arizona and California. I think one of the things that we should consider especially in this connection is the fact that unless we protect the watersheds we are not going to solve some of those problems.

Mr. HILL. And, Mr. Chairman, allow me to say that you do not buy and sell watersheds; you do not buy and sell forests; you create them, and the Lord Himself has something to do with the production of these great forests of the United States.

Listen to these figures: The first State, Nevada; 66.77 percent of Nevada belongs to this Committee, this House, the people of the United States; only 14 percent of the area of the State of Nevada belong to the State of Nevada, and then the gentleman from Minnesota stands up here and says that the State of Nevada should take care of those forests; that is a national responsibility.

No. 2 is the great State of Arizona—and by the way these figures are as of the year 1947. They showed that 73.41 percent of the State of Arizona belongs to the United States, belongs to the House and the Senate and to the people of the United States; and yet they stand here and say: "Let those 25 percent or maybe 26 percent maintain that great Federal area."

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman is making a splendid statement. I am right here to say "Amen" to all of it.

Mr. HILL. But it is not enough to say "Amen." That is what my friends on the Republican side have said in times past: They say "Amen" to every part of it, but they do not vote that way. That is what I need, people to vote with me.

Mr. MURDOCK. Besides saying "Amen" to what the gentleman has said I am going to vote with him. We must protect our forests, watersheds, and all our great estate.

Mr. HILL. Let me tell you with reference to the item I mentioned a moment ago, that the Senate, as I understand, will put in the deficiency bill that item of $345,000 to continue this little experimental work and this work we are doing over there at the present time in the district represented by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Are you going to vote for that when it comes back from conference?

Now, listen to this. The state of—somebody said "confusion." That is the state you fellows are in who are opposing it, a state of confusion, not we who are supporting it.

Now, listen to this. Here is the State of Utah, No. 5. Seventy-two percent of the State of Utah belongs to the Government.

Sixty-three and seventy-six one hundredths percent of the State of Idaho belongs to the Government.

Fifty-three and ninety-two one hundredths percent of the State of Oregon belongs to the Government.

Fifty-one percent of the State of Wyoming belongs to the Government. Over one-half of the State of Wyoming is ours to legislate for.

You can hardly believe this about California, but nearly one-half of that State does not belong to California. It belongs to you and me. Here is the exact figure for 1947: 46.55 percent.

Forty-three and seventy-three one hundredths percent of the State of New Mexico belongs to the Government and 38 percent of the State of Colorado belongs to the Government. For Montana, believe it or not, over 35 percent belongs to the Government.

When you consider those figures and when you consider it is your business to consider this type of legislation, when someone gets up and says, "Let the States do it," it is a silly argument that we should not have to take your time to rebut. This is your land, this is your country. This is my country, this is your country. Let us take care of the park areas, let us take care of the mountain sections that belong to us, then when the appropriation bill comes back from the Senate I hope you will all get in line and vote for the appropriation so that we can continue to protect our forest areas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. May I suggest to the gentleman that he left out the State of California.

Mr. HILL. Oh, no.

Mr. ENGLE. Which is owned 46 percent by the Federal Government.

Mr. HILL. No. The gentleman was not listening. I am sure I read California.

Mr. ENGLE. I beg the gentleman's pardon. We just want to be in the RECORD because we are very much concerned with the problem the gentleman refers to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion let me say that I am not going to offer any amendment, nor will the other Congressmen from Colorado offer an amendment, but we do ask you to consider this matter thoroughly and to decide whether you are in favor of protecting the great areas that belong to the people of the United States, and especially the mountain regions of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak for control of the Englemann spruce bark beetle epidemic in the forests of Colorado.

As I have already stated in this House, unless this insect control project is continued a vast amount of timber in Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico will be exposed to destruction by the beetle epidemic. The insects already have killed 4,000,000,000 board-feet of spruce timber in western Colorado. This is the greatest loss of timber from any single insect epidemic ever experienced in the United States. Sixteen billion more feet of timber are threatened. The watershed values and the scenic values at stake are even greater.

The Appropriations Committee, in proposing the abandonment of the beetle-control work, has said that the Colorado forests are practically worthless because very little of the timber has as yet been sold for lumber. Mr. Chairman, oil in the ground and minerals still unmined have not yet been sold. Hydroelectric power in the form of water still running in the stream has not been sold. Do you call these things worthless? Is timber worthless in the home States of the gentlemen of the committee if it is not currently being cut? I shall be very glad to accept any tracts of such "worthless" timber the gentlemen might wish to give me.

Actually, 4,500,000 cords of this timber, live and bug-killed, already have been purchased by a company which is preparing to erect a pulp mill for the manufacture of paper in the area. This timber will be the basis of a new industry in western Colorado, and it will help to increase the production of much-needed newsprint paper in the United States. We now have to import some 80 percent of our newsprint pulp and paper from foreign countries. If we keep the Colorado spruce forests growing, production of pulp and paper in the area can continue indefinitely.

The Rocky Mountain spruce forests are one of the Nation's great scenic and recreational assets. I cannot give you a dollar figure for their recreational value, but I can tell you that the recreation industry is one of the most important in my State.

The watershed values are the most important of all. The spruce forests of Colorado help to maintain stable soil conditions in the mountain watersheds and to store and regulate the run-off of the snow pack upon which a large number of vital and costly irrigation and electric power projects depend. If we let all the timber be bug-killed, it will be well-nigh impossible to prevent forest fires from completing the destruction over vast areas. Then this House had better get ready to appropriate larger and larger amounts to dredge Colorado silt out of the downstream rivers and harbors and to repair the reservoirs and build the levees higher.

Members of the committee also made a point of the fact that the State had made no contribution toward the cost of the spruce bark beetle control work. Mr. Chairman, this bark beetle infestation is on Federal lands. Its control is a Federal responsibility. It is our responsibility, gentlemen, as representatives of the owners of the timber, the people of the United States.

The States are receiving some nine million dollars of Federal funds a year for the protection of private and State forest lands from fire. Alabama last year received over $300,000; Mississippi $260,000; California nearly one and one-half million dollars; Michigan nearly half a million. That is well and good. But insects can be just as destructive as fires. In many sections they actually cause far greater damage than forest fire. The intelligence of this Congress will be open to question if we spend money to fight one forest enemy while we let another take over by default. The States also received nearly $400,000 of Federal funds this year for production and distribution of tree planting stock to reforest denuded land. That is important too, but while we plant new forests it seems to me equally important that we save from destruction the forests we already have.

The Englemann spruce stands of the Rocky Mountains are one of the important reserves of timber remaining in the United States. It will certainly be needed. Call it worthless or not, it is part of the real wealth of this country. I suggest that we will do well to safeguard and protect that wealth.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] on his excellent presentation of the case for insect control in the national forests.

I can well understand the deep concern of the gentleman from Colorado for the future of the forests of Colorado. We in California have a similar problem. The greatest enemies of our great forests are the insects.

We are spending billions of dollars for national defense and many more billions of dollars for bolstering up the economy of other nations. We must not forget our own basic resources. Forests protect watersheds that are vital for the generation of electric power—vital, also, for irrigation and flood control. They provide outdoor recreation for millions. If kept productive, they can add to our national wealth and support permanent industries and they can mean jobs and payrolls for hundreds of thousands of workers. It is sheer folloy to allow an epidemic of insects to destroy them.

My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL], and other members of the Colorado delegation are particularly interested in making every reasonable effort to stop the ravages of the bark beetle. I am with them in their effort.

The Colorado and its tributaries are the main source of water for 2,500,000 acres of irrigated lands whose income is estimated at about $153,000,000 annually. In addition, some 3,000,000 people of southern California benefit directly from the Colorado by importing 63,000,000 acre feet through the Los Angeles aqueduct for domestic and industrial use and irrigation. Fifteen percent of the water from the Colorado Basin is provided by the area covered by the Engelmann spruce type.

The spruce beetle infestation needs to be fought now, when we can best protect the long-range values of watersheds, timber, recreation, and so on. Bark beetle eradication this year and next is insurance for the future. And we all know insurance is far less costly, in dollars and human effort, than rebuilding after disaster strikes.

I believe in economy, but it is not economy to allow destruction of natural resources upon which our strength depends.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to say a few words in support of the position of my colleague from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

The people of Wyoming are greatly concerned about the beetle epidemic that is now ravaging the Englemann spruce forests of our neighboring State, Colorado. If this infestation is not controlled, the valuable spruce stands of the Medicine Bow National Forest in southern Wyoming will soon be wiped out.

This epidemic is endangering some of the most important watershed lands in the West. These federally owned spruce forests, which are found at high elevations, collect and store the winter snows which insure regular supplies of good clear water for irrigation, hydroelectric power, and domestic purposes by the citizens of the central Rocky Mountain region and adjoining States as well.

If this beetle is allowed to continue its course unchecked, over 16,000,000,000 feet of spruce timber in Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico will be killed outright within the next few years. This is enough timber to build over 1,000,000 5-room houses. To date, over 4,000,000,000 board feet of green timber has been killed.

Besides this huge loss of the timber resource, these great areas of dead, highly inflammable trees constitute a terrific fire hazard. If fire strikes, one of the most terrible forest fires in American history may occur.

May I say to you gentlemen who have not been on a forest-fire line, who have not had to fight forest fires, who have

not been burned out, as I have, at the edge of a spruce stand with only a small lake to save myself and my crew, that this is not an overestimate when I refer to the danger so far as forest fires are concerned. There is nothing more dangerous than dead down timber which a firefighter must combat in trying to get a fire line through such timber.

I believe the committee not only has tried to do a good job but is doing a good job and I commend them for it. But this is not, after all, a problem of the States, totally at least. This is federally owned land. I know in my own State, which I believe is more than 51 percent—I think it is closer to 60 percent—owned by the Federal Government at the present time, that those of us who live there have no control over those forests. We cannot do anything about it. It is up to the Government to control. You cannot measure the value of this timber in dollars and cents. You cannot replace it when it is once burned out. It is worth far more than the committee members say it is in dollars as to the value of the stand itself. Like my friend, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL], I hope that when the conference report comes back to the House and that item is put back in the bill, that you will give it your serious consideration for the preservation of one of the assets which makes this country so great.

(Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

OPS REGULATIONS BRING BACK WORLD WAR II SMALL BUSINESS HEADACHES

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, in the last week, one district office of the OPS has returned 66 percent of the reports submitted by businessmen under the ceiling price regulation system. They were returned because they were incorrectly filled out. That is easy to understand.

One hardware merchant told me that he had spent 50 hours trying to make out the kind of pricing chart the OPS wants. He has another 50 hours to go before he finishes it. This is under Ceiling Price Regulation No. 7, Amendment No. 2. A few more amendments and he will be ready to go out of business entirely.

During the last war, one large industry got a simple explanation of one of the ceiling price regulations. It was written in Chinese.

From all appearances, it looks as if we have learned exactly nothing from the bitter experiences we had under the last control system. Businessmen, particularly small business people, tell me that their rents are higher, their insurance rates are higher, their advertising, payroll, delivery, freight, and tax charges are going up day after day, and nobody has figured out a formula to take care of these items.

We are all trying to keep prices from going sky high. Nobody wants the evils of inflation. But you cannot stop inflation with a lead pencil or a slide rule. If the costs of raw materials, and the costs of production are permitted to rise indefinitely, you cannot ask the little storekeeper to hold the line.

Not even a wisecrack by Michael DiSalle, Administrator for OPS, can change the facts.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AMERICA HAILS THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF REPUBLIC OF ISRAEL

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to call to your attention, and to the attention of the Members, that today we are celebrating the third anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Israel.

It is particularly appropriate that at this time the Honorable David Ben-Gurion, Prime Minister of this youngest member of the family of nations, should be making a visit of state to the United States.

I know that when I express my personal admiration and sympathy for this outpost of the democratic way of life in the midst of feudal Araby I am speaking for all the Members and for most Americans.

Mr. Chairman, it is noteworthy that when the Government of the Republic of Israel proclaimed its independent sovereignty it faced problems of startling similarity to the problems which faced the Continental Congress of the United States 175 years ago; and in addition the now Government came into being, not on an impregnable and untouched continent, but in an area surrounded by hostile neighbors, with no natural frontiers.

DOUBLED POPULATION IN 3 YEARS

Since that historic day in May 1948, when the independent Government of Israel was proclaimed this small country has more than doubled in population. Its consumption of electricity has almost doubled. The land under cultivation has increased by one-half. The national income has increased by one-third.

With a fortitude seldom equaled, Israel has absorbed its vast load of immigrants, enlarged its productive plant, stabilized its finances, fought off aggressive neighbors in one real shooting war and a long series of border clashes, joined and taken an active part in the United Nations.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this is a phenomenal record; and had it not been for the rigid austerity imposed by the people of Israel on themselves the new Republic would have been tossed in a terrible inflation.

In actuality, against all these inflationary pressures, the cost of living has been reduced—not much, perhaps, but measurably.

In the face of external threats of aggressive warfare, internal threats of inflation and religious dissension, and problems which have existed in no other country at the declaration of independence, there has been no resort to authoritarian methods of government.

On the contrary, the people of Israel are probably freer in their individual lives as to religious and political opinion than any other people, including those of the United States.

THEY CALL IT REALISM

It has been necessary to carry out an economic regimentation which American businessmen would find galling; but in Israel it was recognized that the only road to survival lay in rigid economic controls until the danger mark had been passed.

The National Association of Manufacturers might call the Israel economy socialistic; the Israeli call it realistic.

Moreover, the necessity for economic controls has not by any means wiped out private enterprise; except in agriculture, which is largely carried on by collective groups who still are private entrepreneurs, commerce and industry as a whole is carried out by private individual enterprises, with the Government in actual operation only of basic industries with which private capital could not cope.

Cooperatives flourish, and are the mainstay of internal economy.

"THE LAND OF MILK AND HONEY"

Long centuries of economic neglect have reduced the "land of milk and honey"—the Arabian Peninsula—to barren wastes, broken only here and there by modern agricultural methods; and the most striking examples of modern agriculture in the entire peninsula are within the borders of Israel, where for over a half century the Jewish pioneers, in their own homeland, have been reclaiming the desert.

The proposed Jordan Valley Authority, almost certain to become a reality before many more years have passed, will open up new farming territory capable of sustaining the population.

To carry out Israel's own 3-year development program, it is necessary for the government to raise $1,500,000,000; and one-third of this is expected to be realized from the sale of bonds in the United States.

FROM THE HOLY LAND CAME WESTERN CULTURE

I am sure that you and the Members will recognize, Mr. Chairman, that the world Jewish community finds the reestablishment of Israel sovereignty specially inspiring, after a 2,000-year hiatus in a Jewish national government.

At the same time, the Western World must rejoice in the reestablishment, as a nation, of the fount and source of the inspiration of modern ethics.

Without any belittlement of the contributions made to western civilization by the Greeks, the Romans, the Egyptians, and other ancient cultures who were the forerunners of the contemporary Western World, the debt of present-day culture to those rugged clansmen of the old Arab world is beyond all reckoning.

From the Holy Land has come the ethics, the theology, and a vast store of the imagery of four continents.

AMERICANS FIRST

The debt to the Bible of the patriots who brought the United States of America into being almost two centuries ago breathes from almost every line of the Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution.

When the Teutons dressed in dirty furs and lived little better than the animals they pursued, and the first people

of Britain regarded blue mud as sacred decoration and oak trees as deities, the Hebrews in Palestine had a high culture of commerce, husbandry, philosophy, monotheistic religion, a code of ethics which has survived the assaults of all the dangers of the ages, and a concept of the dignity of the individual man which is at the core of the legal code of civilized nations.

Mr. Chairman, it is sometimes questioned whether the Jewish community is wholly loyal to this, our country, in view of the enthusiasm for this new nation at the eastern tip of the Mediterranean, where the ancient Kingdom of Judah flourished.

My answer is an unequivocal yes.

The Jews of America are, first and foremost, Americans, with a burning loyalty to the ideals, the institutions, and the opportunities of America that no people who have forgotten inequalities can understand.

Since the destruction of Jerusalem 20 centuries ago the Jews have been a scattered nation.

Only within the memory of some men still living have the Jews achieved generally the tolerance and acceptance that they found in America from the earliest days.

The Jews have been children of oppression, repression, persecution; they have turned toward the reestablishment of the Jewish homeland with the same eagerness that the far-flung scions of the Irish kings have devoted, wherever they may be, to the liberation of Ireland from the British yoke.

Certainly the British were kinder masters to the Jews than the Russians, the Poles, or the Turks; but free men do not want masters.

They want freedom.

One of the characteristics dominant among Jews has been an independence of the mind and spirit that no laws, no ghettos, no torture chambers, or prison bars could ever root out as bigots tried to do.

From that bright courage of liberty has sprung the Jewish contributions of modern times, making a double debt owed to Israel by the family of nations.

Had the Jews produced no other scientist and philosopher than Albert Einstein, who made the generation of atomic energy possible, the debt would be beyond present calculation; but Einstein is only one intellectual giant in a glittering history sprinkled with the names of great philosophers, great doctors, great scientists, great administrators.

In judging the remarkable gifts given to the world by gifted Jews, it is necessary to bear in mind the duality of fealty.

The ancient Hebrew state, unlike modern Israel, was essentially a democratic theocracy. Religion was the state and the state was religious.

When the Jews were uprooted and cast to the winds, this sense of theocracy persisted, and was nourished by the imposition of restrictive laws aimed at preventing equality of citizenship of the Jews in many lands.

Wherever Jews were welcomed and made equal, that sense of nationalism became submerged in patriotic devotion to the land of birth; yet even in America there remained the dream of a reestablishment of the Jewish nation.

The advent of the horrors of political anti-Semitism, and of genocide as a national policy in Germany and its satellites, and now in Russia and its satellites, refreshed this dream, and accounts for the eagerness with which world Jewry supports and encourages the Republic of Israel, with no loss of love for the land to which each Jew may owe his political allegiance.

Mr. Chairman, on this solemn occasion, and on behalf of my coreligionists everywhere, I wish to declare the debt of gratitude which Jews owe to all men of goodwill who contributed to the establishment of the Republic of Israel.

This is something over and beyond any local partisanship.

At the same time, I am intensely proud that my own Democratic Party, and my own party leaders, have done so much toward the establishment and the stabilization of Israel.

(Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

For necessary expenses in connection with conducting investigations of the relative utility and economy of agricultural products for food, clothing, and other uses in the home, with special suggestions of plans and methods for the more effective utilization of such products for these purposes, and such economic investigations, including housing and household buying, as have for their purpose the improvement of the rural home, for coordinating nutrition services made available by Federal, State, and other agencies, and for disseminating useful information on these subjects, $1,350,000.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIKES: Page 9, line 8, strike out "$1,350,000" and insert "$1,000,000."

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I do not take the floor to criticize the subcommittee which brought in this bill. As a matter of fact, I think this subcomittee has done one of the outstanding jobs of the year. Its personnel are able men, and its chairman has distinguished himself from the beginning of his career in Congress as sound, as able, as conscientious, and as thorough in his work. I recognize the fact that this bill already has been cut materially, and I do not think there are many places where it should be cut more. But, I feel with the cost of maintaining the defense of this Nation so high that it is astronomical, that we have to try to save even a few dollars anywhere we can. I have asked that this item "Human nutrition and home economics" be cut from a proposed $1,350,000 to $1,000,000, recognizing first that the committee already has allotted less than the budget estimate and less than the money contained in the bill in fiscal 1951. But I want to point out, Mr. Chairman, that the appropriation proposed for this Bureau is approximately five times what it was a decade ago. The Bureau is asking for five times as much money as it had 10 years ago. That would indicate that this bureau, along with many other bureaus of the Government, has mushroomed more than there is justification for, and that it can and should be trimmed.

Mr. Chairman, I urge this cut in addition on the premise that the committee itself in its report on page 7 states:

The committee feels that some projects of this Bureau should be postponed during the current emergency.

The amendment I offer would give real effect to that suggestion, and I do not think anything essential would be sacrificed.

I feel that it is an actual fact, Mr. Chairman, that private industry is far ahead of Government in most fields of research, that private industry is going to carry on the load as far as research is concerned, and that private industry will well take up any slack that may result from a cut in this little item for the fiscal year 1952.

I want to point out one other thing: We are spending not millions but hundreds of millions of dollars in military research. You say it is a far cry from home nutrition and home economics to military research, but I question that. Actually the dollars we are spending on military research go also into every possible phase of food and matériel testing. The facts that are brought out in that research and in industrial research are made available to all of the people of this country, and benefits from it accrue very directly to the housewives of this country.

Therefore, in all kindness to this able committee, whose work and whose members I respect most highly, I believe we can safely make this cut at this time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my good friend from Florida has almost disarmed me with the nice statements he made about the committee. It is like an appellate court saying, "The learned court below," just before knocking the whey out of his decision. It is appreciated, however. Did you notice in his argument that the chief argument for cutting that item more is that it has already been cut? It that a wise way to handle appropriations on the floor? This appropriation has been cut 25 percent in the last 2 years. I take credit for having taken the leadership on it.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. We cut the estimate over $700,000 last year.

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes; we cut that much from the estimates.

In this time of food shortage, when we need to learn how to get by under the high cost of living, how to can vegetables so that they will retain their quality, how to get the vitamins we need, when 35 or 40 percent of those drafted into the

Army are turned down because of malnutrition, a further cut in this item does not seem appropriate. I cannot say how many dollars they ought to have for this Bureau and I do not profess to know, but I say when you overlook the problems to which they should be seeking the answers you are being shortsighted.

I know my friend from Florida is motivated by the highest intent in offering this amendment, but have you noticed how aware he is of the things that happen in the military? It is because he sits on that committee and listens to it. When he brings his bill here I am going to listen to him, because he will know what he is talking about. But when he comes here on the floor on another matter, behind which is just as much detailed testimony and evidence, with which he is not familiar, I think he should listen to us. But since I still give him the right to have his opinion, I am sure he will give me the right to mine.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. BUDGE. I just wonder if this is the outfit that sent me those 3,000 cookbooks that I do not need.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman may not need them, but if he studies the question of the nutrition of the people of America and studies the number of people that are turned down by the draft boards because of malnutrition he will realize that something needs to be done. There may be a thousand plans that can be offered, but something certainly needs to be done. I do want to say the work of this bureau is very important. I cannot say how much money they should have. I have certainly indicated we do not want to give them too much money because, as has been pointed out, we have reduced their budget in the last two years by seven hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I simply was hoping that the gentleman would reiterate that point, Mr. Chairman, that we did make a very considerable cut on this particular bureau last year.

Mr. WHITTEN. We on the subcommittee have never followed the practice of upping these estimates by 20 percent so that the House could take it out, and I hope you will not charge us with indulging in that sort of practice, because we have never done that. We have listened to three months of testimony, and we have cut anywhere that we thought we could. Havin gdone that, we leave the question to you. I think the amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SIKES) there were—ayes 38, noes 54.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

White pine blister rust: White pine blister rust, pursuant to the Act of April 26, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 594a), $3,300,000, of which $505,000 shall be available to the Department of the Interior for the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering Federal lands under the jurisdiction of that Department or lands of Indian tribes which are under the jurisdiction of or retained under restrictions of the United States; $1,750,000 to the Forest Service for the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering lands under its jurisdiction; and $1,045,000 to the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine for leadership and general coordination of the entire program, method development, and for operations conducted under its direction for such control, including, but not confined to, the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering State and privately owned lands.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: Page 18, line 16, strike out "$3,300,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,000,000."

Page 18, line 16, strike out "$505,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$400,000."

On page 18, line 23, strike out "$1,045,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$850,000."

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to reduce the appropriation for white-pine blister rust by $300,000. This item is shown on page 31 of the committee report, it being the first item on that page. Three million four hundred and twenty-nine thousand dollars was appropriated for the program last year. The budgest estimate this year is $3,407,000. The committee recommends $3,330,000, which is a cut of $107,000.

The breakdown of the appropriation is shown on page 1065 of the hearings, and the detailed testimony regarding the program is set forth in the hearings on pages 1088 to 1103.

This is a program which began in 1916, with a Federal appropriation of $20,000 and State contributions of $21,974. The Federal appropriation gradually increased year by year as these things always do, and in 1933 the Federal appropriation was $604,501. The States contributed in that year $233,250.

Since 1933 the Federal appropriation has fluctuated up and down, mostly up, and in 1951 it amounted to $3,429,250, with additional State contributions in that year of $683,869. Since 1916 total Federal appropriations have amounted to $62,308,029. This sum includes $20,293,983 of NRA, WPA, and so forth, funds designated as emergency funds, between the years 1934 and 1942, inclusive. Prior to the year 1934, the year these WPA or emergency funds first began to be appropriated, the largest Federal appropriation to this purpose had been $708,560. In the year 1934, it appears that the project was turned into one of these WPA or NRA emergency projects, and that year the Federal appropriation jumped to $2,412,157. It has never gotten back to the status it occupied prior to 1934, and since that time it has fluctuated and gradually increased until in 1951 the Federal appropriation was $3,429,250.

In his testimony regarding this item, Mr. C. M. Granger, Assistant Chief of the Forest Service, testified that in general it is proposed to carry along the program in the same way as it has been carried on for a number of years, substantially at the same level—the same nature of operation.

He was asked the question, "Is this going to be a continuing program from now on?" and he answered, "I think there will always have to be some activity in this field. Its dimensions are speculative."

I have noted from the hearings—page 977—that the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee had an investigation made last year regarding the operation of this program.

The investigators reported, among other things—page 982—that this white pine blister rust program had five levels of supervision above the working level, namely, division, region, area, State, and district. The investigators stated the opinion that economies could be achieved without program impairment through the elimination of the area and the State supervisors, and through the reduction in the number of districts.

Further criticism by those investigators is set forth on page 984 of the hearings regarding conditions which the Bureau states were corrected by subsequent action.

The investigators recommended a reduction in the number of districts in the Northeastern and North Central regions, which they stated should reduce overhead costs and result in fuller utilization of automotive equipment. The Bureau answered that criticism with the statement subsequently that the work of 10 State offices had been consolidated in 3 area offices in the Northeastern region, resulting in a reduction in personnel of 6 people, and that in the North Central region the number of districts was reduced from 7 to 6, but the Bureau reported no reduction in personnel as a result.

The investigators recommended that four Bureau offices in the San Francisco area should be consolidated and administered by the regional office of the blister rust-control program. The report of the investigators contained other references and suggestions, in addition to those I have mentioned.

They may be found on pages 991, 995, 996, 997, 998, 1003, 1004, 1005, 1006, 1007 of the hearings.

I believe it is obvious to anyone who studies the operation of this program that there has been inefficiency in its operation, and that taxpayers' money has been wasted.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that the territory covered by this blister-rust proposition is owned in about even quantities between private interests and the Government?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I have understood that the ownership of the land involved is about 50–50 between the Federal Government and private interests.

Mr. TABER. And the private interests contribute only one-third of the cost of protecting their own forests.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I have heard that said; I do not know.

Mr. TABER. That is what I understand the facts are.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi, [Mr. WHITTEN] took the Bureau to task as shown on page 1011 of the hearings, where he said, among other things:

Mr. WHITTEN. I hate to keep quarreling with this Bureau but we mean to do something about this. We mean business about it. If we have to set aside money to hire some outsider to come in here and coordinate and set this thing up on an operational basis, we are ready to do it.

Prior to 1924 and before the WPA era, this program operated, and I presume very satisfactorily, on a Federal appropriation of a little more than half a million dollars, as you will see from page 1094 of the hearings.

As I have already stated, when the program was made an emergency program in the WPA era, the appropriation jumped from $604,501 in 1933 to $2,412,157 in 1934.

Since that time, it has never gotten back to its pre-WPA normal status, and the amount which it has been receiving annually for a number of years just for coordination and supervisory work alone is considerably more than the annual cost of the entire program before the WPA era.

The entire program cost the Federal Government in 1933 $604,501. The coordination and supervisory cost alone this year is $725,450, and in the 1950 fiscal year it was $727,638. The amount appropriated in this bill before us today is approximately $705,000 while the amount carried in this bill to pay for the actual work done in the field in the national forests is $1,750,000. Thus we see that $1 is spent for supervisory and coordination work to every $2.50 which is spent in the field. In other words, the ratio of labor cost to that of supervision and coordination is two and a half to one, approximately, and that, in my opinion, is not justified and should be corrected.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Is this an appropriation for Federal land so far as the white pine blister rust is concerned?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. It is for Federal land, it is also for State land and for privately owned land.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, as I stated, the ratio of labor cost to that of supervision and coordination is 2½ to 1 and, in my opinion, that is not justified and should be corrected. In fact, it would not surprise me at all to find that a proper investigation would disclose that this program could be taken out of the emergency or WPA status it has occupied since 1934, and placed back to the status it occupied in 1933 and for many years prior to 1933 without impairing the program.

The States are now contributing approximately as much as the Federal Government contributed prior to 1934.

The amendment which I offered calls for a cut of $105,000 in the amount which is transferred from this program to the Department of the Interior. Under the amendment $400,000 will be transferred to the Department of the Interior instead of $505,000. The amendment further calls for a cut of $195,000 in the fund of approximately $700,000 designated for leadership, coordination, and technical direction. This is more than the whole program cost in 1933, and I think the cut proposed in the supervisory end of it is thoroughly justified. I have not proposed to touch at all by this amendment the $1,750,000 appropriated to pay for the actual work done in the field.

I hope the subcommittee will investigate next year the feasibility of simply matching State funds contributed to this program, and see if it cannot be taken out of the emergency or WPA category and placed back on a normal basis.

Certainly, I think the reduction proposed in this amendment will not do the slightest harm to the program, and that it is a saving which should be effected.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia has made a very fine statement and I am inclined to agree with many of his deductions. It so happens that one of the largest and most valuable stands and one of the largest and most valuable portions of our national resources in that category are located in the Panhandle of Idaho, in the district represented by my colleague from Idaho [Mr. WOOD]. My own district borders it. We do have to protect these trees from that disease which does attack and kill the trees. It is a matter of protection of our national resources.

The points made by the gentleman from Georgia are valid and I assure him that the committee has been working on that phase of it very diligently.

I think we are ready for a vote on the amendment, as far as I am concerned. It is merely a matter of continuing to try to do the things the gentleman from Georgia has indicated should be done and we are making that effort, and to weigh against that a known cause in protecting our known national resources. I trust the amendment will be decisively voted down.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, here again we have evidence of the difficulty the committee encounters in handling important problems. There is not a more sincere Member of the Congress than is the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS]. The facts he cited to this committee awhile ago come from a report to my subcommittee. But why was the report made? It was because I asked for an investigation of this program.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The gentleman will recall that I so stated in my remarks.

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes, I appreciate that. The point I want to make is that when I succeeded to the chairmanship of this subcommittee, it was my purpose, and I have taken action, to investigate every phase in the Department where there was any question in my mind.

There are tremendous values tied up in the white pine of this country. Lumber at the present time is selling at almost unheard of prices. Somebody said that cottonwood, one of the poorest grades of lumber in the South, was selling at $35 a thousand on the stump; timber that had no use at all just a few years ago. Now, this great stand of timber, one of the greatest national resources we have, is threatened with total destruction by reason of this white pine blister rust. It has tremendous value. The Nation is dependent on it to a large extent, and there is no reason but what in this instance the Federal Government should do what it can to save this timber. I think all of us will agree with that. The question is how to go about doing that most economically? I, too, thought they were spending too much in supervision. I asked for this investigation and put the facts in the RECORD, and pointed out that we could not put up with that at all. But, whatever amount of money you put in here is inadequate to fully meet the needs, and instead of trying to take away the money to protect this millions and millions of dollars worth of timber, it would appear to be better business to instruct them to cut out this excessive supervision waste and to apply the money to get rid of the condition which destroys this timber.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I would like to ask the gentleman from Arkansas where this white pine blister rust comes from.

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, I have worked with this committee about 8 years and I still do not know where a lot of things come from. But, it is found in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Georgia, and out in Utah.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Your report shows, does it not, that the fungus that causes it is under reasonable control, which I believe is the language you use, or the testimony given, throughout the entire area. Is that not correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman has probably read the report in detail since I have, since he was preparing this amendment. Usually you get a report that it is under reasonable control. I also had a report that the operation was handled on a reasonable basis. And when I checked it I found it was not, and I put that report in the RECORD. But it does not follow that you should end a program if the objective is something that the Nation depends on. What you should do is to correct the thing that is wrong, and that is what we have set out to do.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. As far as I was able to see in reading the testimony about it, after you made that demand on them, they only represented that they eliminated seven people from their personnel.

Mr. WHITTEN. How much time elapsed from the time it was reported to the time they said how much they had done?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Your investigation was made last year, was it not?

Mr. WHITTEN. The investigation was made last year, but it was reported to me in connection with the hearings that we could proceed——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I understand this is an annual appropriation. What report can the gentleman give the House as to the progress made in stopping this disease in the white-pine forests of the country?

Mr. WHITTEN. So far as eradication is concerned, I cannot give the gentleman any report that shows that this disease is being eradicated, but by getting rid of the disease we are keeping it from spreading. In some States they have been able to get rid of it.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. On that point, I want this to be before the committee: The ground we lost in the control of this disease during the war years, when manpower and funds were restricted somewhat, we made up in the fiscal year 1947, when we expended about $6,000,000 and did catch up pretty well with the ground we had lost. That is the reason for the appropriations since then. We think we are on a maintenance basis now, not an eradication basis.

Mr. DONDERO. In other words, there is no hope that this thing will be stamped out completely and save the white-pine forests?

Mr. WHITTEN. There is nothing that I recall that would indicate they have any hopes of doing it. But by spending this money they think they can save many times in value the amount of the cost. That is a matter we have gone into. If there are any further questions, I think our record on this committee indicates that we have investigated every phase of the Department of Agriculture and taken appropriate action.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. This problem has been studied in Massachusetts. I notice the gentleman mentioned Maine, and my honorable colleague from that State stood up and wanted an answer as to that State. But this disease comes from raspberries, they say, wild raspberries. They have made everybody in Massachusetts—I do not know about Maine or somewhere else—do away with their raspberry raising, so that they will not get this white-pine blister rust. Yet we still have white-pine blister rust.

May I call the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi to the fact that these white-pine forests are owned by individuals, and they ought to look out for their own property.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I should like to remind the gentleman—he doubtless knows it—that there is an experimental forest in York County in my district, a white pine forest, and they are engaged in this work there. While I do not know very much about the technicalities of white pine blister rust, it is a useful work, and I should be very sorry to see it interrupted, because it is only by governmental experimentation that the individual private owner can hope to profit.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. On this matter of the preservation of the forests, is it not a fact, as we recognize it up in my State of New Hampshire, that after you have succeeded in pretty well eradicating the undergrowth, the bush that spreads this rust, you get the thing under control, so that you have virtually succeeded in isolating the disease, and with a much less amount of expenditure and effort you can hold the thing down. In many States, such as mine, we have nearly reached the point where we can say that we have virtually got the matter under control. Is that not correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is correct. This deals with something that is a national asset in time of emergency, and it looks as if we are in one series of emergencies after another. I do not know what the answer is so far as looking after the forests of this Nation is concerned. I know we are dependent on them. I know they are threatened. We tried on this committee to work out a better way of handling it. If you will read the report, you will find we have called on the Department to give consideration to the elimination of a number of control programs, and to determine how we can get a 50-percent contribution from private or State funds, and how to have adequate State laws and to see that they are enforced. We are investigating every means of getting more for your dollar. However, in view of the tremendous value of this timber I think the answer is not to cut out the work, but to bring about a more effective use of the funds. That is what your committee has tried to do.

The gentleman from Georgia is fair. I do not want to pass up this opportunity to say again as chairman of this committee that we insisted on this investigation, trying to make the dollar go where it would do the most good. We also put it in this report. If you will just read the hearings I think you will find that the committee does not deal with the Department easily and that when we find this kind of situation existing or where we even suspect that it exists, we will investigate it. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

[Mr. NICHOLSON addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I cannot agree with my colleague from the South [Mr. DAVIS], but I think that great study should be given to the problem of conserving our national resources. The gentleman spoke about the emergency existing in the OPA days. I can recall those days. I was here. I can recall when there was not a bank in the United States that could pay off their depositors. Fourteen million wage earners were seeking work but could not obtain it. As a result of the foresight of the Members of this House, emergency money was set up to provide work, to provide labor. Much of it was performed in our forests, along our waterways, and in the construction of schools, dams, stockponds, and hospitals.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. But that emergency is over now, is it not?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes. But if you will let me finish, I want to say to you that you are comparing the dollar then with the dollar now. If you had a dollar then and you had a sock you would put it in the sock rather than in a bank. That dollar would buy something. You cannot perform the same functions in any walk of life now that you could at that time with the same dollar because the dollar has been changed. Even since we have been voting appropriations for the war effort, costs have gone up and we have lost two billion dollars. But when you see the forests of this great Nation being destroyed by pests, whether it be rust, beetle, or what not, and do not take any action, then we are making

one of the greatest mistakes we have ever made in this Congress. We had technicians who are trained to work and do the things necessary to stop those pests. In the West I have seen the sun shining beautifully and within 15 minutes you could not see the sun because the grasshoppers were in flight. I have seen hundreds of thousands of acres of crops destroyed overnight in that way.

This is a great Nation. We have different sections and different areas and different problems. I see the gentleman from the South whose problem it is to stop the water from destroying property. I was always happy to vote with him to do that. We in the other part of the Nation, in the West, build dams. We do that not to stop destruction but to impound the water that we may provide water for cultivation during a drought. In parts of my State of New Mexico today we are not permitted to wash an automobile because we have the greatest drought we have had in 50 years. When a committee of this Congress comes in here and has studied the problems they were told to consider, I say they are specialists in that line of activity. If I am going to get up and ask to have a great amount of money stricken out that has to do with conserving our national resources, I will make a study of it and try to become a technician and then I will go before the committee and argue it out with them. But from what I have seen since I came back to this Congress—and I was happy to come back because I love everybody here—when I see what we are doing I do not think it is with any great vision. We are getting up here and offering amendments taking a couple of hundred thousands from this, that, or the other thing, and we are not familiar with the problem at all. I think study should be given to this thing. If it had not been for the foresight of this Congress during those emergency days, we would not have any forests today. Unless you keep up these applications by whatever is necessary to destroy these pests, it will continue to grow greater all the time.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes, I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Does the gentleman mean to say that the gentleman from Georgia has not studied this problem?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I do not mean any criticism of the gentleman from Georgia. I am not here to criticize any individual. I am here to give you my impressions. I know the West, I know the East. I was born in the East. I know the South. I made a great investment down in the South, and an expensive one. I married a girl from Kentucky, and it was my most profitable investment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from New Mexico who preceded me I, too, think we fail to see the over-all picture. As to private industry and what it is doing, let us go back to 1902 and take, as an example, the case of the United States Steel Corp. when that company gave to Andrew Carnegie $300,000,000 for all of his wealth and vast holdings. That included coal mines all over the United States, his railroads from Lake Erie to Pittsburgh, his huge steel plants, coking plants, everything, for $300,000,000.

This Congress gave $450,000,000 to the United States Steel, or to Ben Fairless, its president, only last month to build a new steel plant, just one, not hundreds of units as was the case in the Carnegie-United States Steel transaction.

Let us take another case; let us go back to 1932 and look at the Republic Steel Corp., the second largest corporation in the United States. At that time it was selling on the big board at 98 cents a share. Look where it has expanded to today, and yet back in 1932 they were getting ready to write it off the big board selling at 98 cents a share. But now we see this Government giving this one big corporation, at a time when you are trying to curtail efforts of this agency to save our great forests, giving this one steel company $450,000,000 to build one plant.

In talking about our forests, I have heard much talk today about New England, and I think we should take into consideration that historic part of our country. But you can get into an automobile in Rhode Island, if you will, in the morning, and be in New Hampshire by nightfall, having covered a large part of New England. But you will not do that out West where the national forests are about which we are talking. It will take you in some instances, days to drive over one of those States.

As the country grows and our economy expands the cost of government grows and our obligation to look after our natural resources grows. When we gave United States Steel the right to break ground at Morristown, Pa., 1 month ago and build that great plant on the Delaware River we thereby fastened additional expenses on the State of Pennsylvania and the Federal Government in the matter of keeping the Delaware River clean and to avoid the harmful effects of things that United States Steel is going to dump into that river. And so it is all over the Nation. It is expansion that makes this great Government great. Before we went into Korea the national economy stood at around $280,000,000,000 a year and it is undoubtedly higher today. We certainly were going to town alongside of 1932 and 1933.

I certainly hope this amendment is defeated.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. I wonder if we can get some agreement as to time. I do not like to cut anybody off, but I do hope we can get along with the bill because for various reasons that everyone knows, we want to move along with the bill. I will not submit any consent request to limit debate, but I hope we can soon get back to reading the bill.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I am one Member on my side of the aisle who has consistently voted for every amendment to reduce appropriations. I have done that in the belief that this Government must remain solvent if it is to remain a world power. But here we are dealing with an amendment which cuts down an appropriation to preserve one of the natural resources of this land, that is lumber and timber. It so happens that I come from a State—Michigan—one of whose glories once was its pine forests. They have completely disappeared; they are gone. Nothing remains but vast areas of rotting stumps. Today we are reforesting these areas of stump land in many parts of the State, in upper Michigan and the upper part of the lower peninsula. The only thing that restricts the amount of reforestation is the amount of funds available. A year or two ago I participated in a conference at Michigan State College, East Lansing, Mich., and examined the question of how fast this country was using its timber or lumber in comparison to the speed with which nature was reproducing it. My recollection is that we are using lumber almost twice as fast as nature is reproducing it. If that be true, and I think it is, how long will it be before this country will be entirely denuded of timber, which is one of our vital resources, particularly for national defense? For that reason I think it is a mistake to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] I have a great respect for him, I know his opinion in regard to the financial and economic status of the Nation. It is very much like my own, but I doubt very much the wisdom of accepting this amendment. It will do more harm than good.

If we are to continue and preserve this great natural resource for the benefit of the American people, it seems to me we must do everything possible to keep under control and eradicate a disease that will destroy our timber before it can be used. I listened with great interest to the gentleman from New Mexico, our able colleague and former Governor of that State [Mr. DEMPSEY], and what he said in regard to this question I reiterate and affirm.

So I hope that the committee this afternoon, even though it is economy minded, might take a second look at the amendment before a vote is taken. I think it would be best for the country that in this one instance—and perhaps the only instance for many weeks on this floor that I stand up in opposition to the amendment. The amendment should be voted down.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. May I say to the gentleman that I also come from a State which was formerly a lumber-producing State. It suffered for many years because of the ruthlessness of private industry exploitation. Now we are in the same position as is the gentleman and his State of Michigan. We are in the process of reforestation. I thoroughly agree with the comments the gentleman

has just made. I feel in the matter of economy exactly as he does.

Mr. DONDERO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. I also wish to join my colleagues from Colorado who have spoken in support of the Engelmann spruce bark beetle project in Colorado. It is appropriate to discuss our Colorado project in connection with the pending amendment, as both involve the conservation of our natural resources.

I realize there are many Members of this body who are not entirely familiar with the problems of the West such as we are discussing here today. My parents came from an eastern State, the great State of Maryland, and settled in Colorado in the early days of that State. I am a native of Colorado. Naturally, these problems are more familiar to me as a westerner than to others who live in the East. When you are properly informed as to our immediate problem in combating the attack of these beetles in our Colorado forests I am sure you will be sympathetic and will give us your support in obtaining the necessary funds for this project.

In Colorado we are very much concerned over this matter. We do not want to lose our spruce forests, which are so valuable, not alone to Colorado, but to the entire Nation. We feel that these spruce trees, which will be destroyed by these insects, unless we act promptly, should be preserved. These are national forests and this is a direct responsibility of the Federal Government.

This beetle infestation struck last year. I was not a Member of this body at that time. Congress appropriated $2,000,000 to wage this fight. As the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] stated this afternoon, no amendment will be offered to this bill for funds for our Colorado project. However, we are hoping Congress will provide the necessary funds to continue the work so effectively started last year.

I understand the Senate may include an item for this project in the deficiency appropriation bill now pending in that body, in which event we hope the House will concur in the Senate action.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I would like to associate myself with the gentleman from Colorado in opposition to this amendment. We have this problem in the Sierra Nevada Mountains in California, and I think we should not turn down any appropriation that might result in the loss of a lot of timber. That is one of the few last resources that we ought to preserve. The beetles are raising havoc with millions of acres of fine Federal timberlands in California. We should not further hamper the Forest Service in their fight to kill this pest by reducing this already shrunken appropriation. I would like to support the gentleman's ideas in this matter and help him defeat this amendment.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I appreciate the observations of the gentleman from California, and we are glad to have his support. I have observed, in the years I have served in this body, that frequently we spend much time debating the merits of appropriations involving just a few thousand dollars and enter into bitter arguments over these small items. However, when we get to the larger amounts and start to dealing in billions of dollars, we pass these appropriations quickly and sometimes with very little debate. It is strange that when we come in with a modest request for funds desperately needed to protect our great national forests, involving large quantities of valuable timber, we suddenly become economy minded. We pass appropriation bills for billions of dollars to be spent all over the world and consider our action lightly, but hesitate to spend a few dollars to preserve our natural resources here at home. We must be realistic and the time is here when we should pay more attention to these problems affecting our Western States. Of course, most of our great natural resources are located in the West, including our national forests. These great forests provide timber which will be so essential in our defense effort and which we need for our industrial development. It is unthinkable, it is unbelievable that we should refuse to appropriate what money is needed to make certain that this threat to our Colorado national forests is immediately repelled. I am no expert on forestry; I am not familiar personally with this beetle problem. I would not know a beetle if I saw one, but I have confidence in our Forest Service. They say they can get rid of these beetles if given the money to do the job, and I am certainly in favor of giving them a chance. A good start was made last year, and we cannot afford to abandon the project now.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Most people who are not from the far West do not know that the insects and the forest diseases actually harvest more timber every year in the far West than all of the commercial lumber companies put together; in other words, the insect logging company does more business in the far West than all other commercial logging companies put together, and we spend millions of dollars for fire protection, but for every tree we save from fire there is one that goes to the beetle.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I thank the gentleman for that very pertinent observation. No doubt we have overlooked the damage done by these beetles to our timber, not alone in Colorado, but in all of our Western States. The present beetle threat is confined largely to Colorado at this time, although I understand it is spreading into Wyoming and New Mexico. Unless this beetle infestation is conquered I am advised that it will destroy a major portion of our spruce trees in Colorado, which would truly be a disaster. Let us act while there is still time.

(Mr. CHENOWETH and Mr. DONDERO asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks.)

(Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is certainly amusing to see the Members of Congress meet themselves coming back. Just about 3 days ago they passed some amendments here concerning power lines that turned back the clock for a generation, unless the Senate has the wisdom to knock them out.

You talk about these pine trees, and I am as much for conserving the timber of this country as anyone, but do you know that in recent years they have developed a process of manufacturing aluminum out of clay? From 25 to 40 percent of all clay is aluminum. There is enough aluminum in the average pine hill to supply the world. That is what one of their experts told me. He pointed to a hill out east of Tupelo where I live, and he said, "There is enough aluminum in that hill to supply the world." We have to have an abundance of cheap electricity to process it, to develop that aluminum. That is being done now, and houses are being built of aluminum, and more and more houses will be built of it as the years go by. They will be cheaper, perhaps, they will be absolutely bug and rat proof. You will see houses in the future with the framework and the inner walls made of aluminum, and probably brick or stone used for veneer.

This new day is dawning, and yet less than a week ago this Congress took it on itself to paralyze the development of the water power of this Nation and turned down an amendment that would have provided funds to demonstrate this new process of generating electricity from sun heat that, if successful, can generate untold trillions of kilowatt-hours of electricity every year.

Just as surely as the sun shines, President Peron of Argentina is using that very process today, and he says that in 2 years from now the entire Republic of Argentina will be electrified with electricity produced by the use of the sun's heat.

I remember a few years ago Congress passed a resolution to destroy all the starlings in this town, over my protest, when the starlings were destroying the Japanese beetles that were threatening to destroy every tree in Washington and the surrounding area. Thank the Lord, the starlings survived and the beetles disappeared. You do not see one today. That menace seems to have been destroyed in spite of Congress.

As far as I am concerned, I would turn these forests back to the States. I would turn every forest back to the State in which it is situated. The people of those localities know more and think more about preserving the timber than does somebody 1,000 or 3,000 miles away. Then you would not have to have all those men roaming around on the Federal payroll looking at the trees. I have never seen a man look at a pine tree yet and change its growth.

Where I live you can turn out a field in the sandy area and the next year it will grow up in pine bushes, and those bushes will grow, as a rule, something an inch in diameter every year. In 10 or 12 years you will have timber big enough to make lumber. But if you will give us the power we are entitled to, give us this 400,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power that you literally sealed up the other day with those amendments, let us use that and firm it up to the peak of the average year, and let them put on this experiment and show whether or not they can develop electricity from the sun's heat and provide those trillions of kilowatt-hours of electricity, if successful, they can produce more building material in 1 year than you can grow in 50 years with pine trees; and those fir trees in the Northwest do not grow half as rapidly as do the pine trees in the Southern States.

I just want to say to the Congress that many of you are meeting yourselves coming back so abruptly that I do not know whether you are going to survive the shock or not.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WOOD].

(Mr. WOOD of Idaho asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I spoke yesterday on the infestation of blister rust in my district in northern Idaho. This spruce beetle as yet has not affected my area. However, it has crossed over into two other States, and no doubt shortly will be getting into my territory, and I shall be very much exercised about it.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. Another pest has been mentioned here as an example of the ability of the pest fighters to control a given pest. I think it was the tussock moth, was it not, that was eradicated in the Coeur d'Alene area by very adept and adroit work on the part of the Forest Service?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Yes. The gentleman who takes care of that work is a very ardent friend and patient of mine. The question that has come up here which seems to be a stumbling block is the fact that there does not seem to be any immediate respite against these infestations. Well, I am a physician, and I am still a physician, even though I happen to be a Congressman. I have fought through a great many epidemics. I remember very well the flu epidemic of 1918. We doctors fought as valiantly as we could with the poor tools that we had to fight with. We did not eradicate it in a year. I am not too sure we even did a great deal toward eradicating it at all. As one of the gentlemen previously said here a while ago, sometimes these things seem to have a self-limited course. But one must bear in mind there is a tremendous amount of destruction in human life during the course of an epidemic. Certainly if there is anything we can do it is our duty and our right to do it. I think in all probability, as far as I can find out, this work of planning the attack on the spruce beetle was not very well thought out to begin with. It was a new thing, and there were many mistakes made, as to the length of time it would take to eradicate it, and as to the best means of doing it. Inasmuch as it was not eradicated within the year, but even seemed to have spread after a year, a great many of the Members of Congress seemed to feel that the effort is not worth while. I do not think one can draw that conclusion. I certainly stand behind my neighboring State of Colorado and Nevada, I believe it is, in asking that the Congress consider restoring the cut of the funds necessary to fight the spruce beetle, or at least not to cut the measure any more so that the funds may be sufficient, or perhaps by some diversion have sufficient funds, so that a real attack may be made on this wicked infestation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia) there were—ayes 35, noes 81.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

National forest protection and management: For the administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement, and development of the national forests, including the establishment and maintenance of forest tree nurseries, including the procurement of tree seed and nursery stock by purchase, production, or otherwise, seeding and tree planting and the care of plantations and young growth; the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed three; the maintenance of roads and trails and the construction and maintenance of all other improvements necessary for the proper and economical administration, protection, development, and use of the national forests, including experimental areas under Forest Service administration, except that where direct purchases will be more economical than construction, improvements may be purchased; the construction (not to exceed $15,000 for any one structure), equipment, and maintenance of sanitary and recreational facilities; timber cultural operations; development and application of fish and game management plans; propagation and transplanting of plants suitable for planting on semiarid portions of the national forests; estimating and appraising of timber and other resources and development and application of plans for their effective management, sale, and use; expenses of the National Forest Reservation Commission as authorized by section 14 of the act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 514); examination, classification, surveying, and appraisal of land incident to effecting exchanges authorized by law and of lands within the boundaries of the national forests that may be opened to homestead settlement and entry under the act of June 11, 1906, and the act of August 10, 1912 (16 U. S. C. 506–509), as provided by the act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C. 512); investigation and establishment of water rights, including the purchase thereof or of lands or interests in lands or rights-of-way for use and protection of water rights necessary or beneficial in connection with the administration and public use of the national forests; and all expenses necessary for the use, maintenance, improvement, protection, and general administration of the national forests, $27,122,025, of which not to exceed $75,000 shall be available for the purchase of three nursery sites.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, of course the vote has been taken now and the amendment which I offered has been defeated. As we all do when we lose a proposition, we bow to the will of the majority. However, in the short time that was allowed me to discuss this amendment, not wanting to impose myself on the body more than necessary, I did not have time to discuss as much of the detail as I would like to have done.

A great many of the Members in whose States this money is spent, of course, had the fear that to cut this appropriation would interfere with the work. If the amendment had been adopted it would not have interfered with the work at all in those States in the infested areas. The truth of the business is the main control work that is done in the field is pulling up currant and gooseberry bushes, and a little spraying, and it is so stated in the hearings by the expert from the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine. The amendment did not touch the money for the work in the field. Mr. STIGLER, a member of the committee, asked this question:

I see you have an item of $1,084,500 under the white pine blister rust control operations. Would you care to comment on that?

Mr. Granger said:

That is the national forest part of the fund, Mr. Chairman, which is used for direct control work out in the field. That consists principally of destroying the currant and gooseberry bushes, which furnish the alternate host for this disease. That is the means of controlling mostly by pulling them up, though there is some spraying done.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] thought that this was going to affect the work of destroying beetles in the forests. Others thought it would interfere with the forestry work from other angles, but I want it understood, because I do not just get up and offer an amendment to cut an appropriation for the sake of seeing that we cut something. I want it understood that this was to cut the supervisory cost of this program, and in my opinion it should have been cut, and I still think it should have been cut. I want to repeat what I said, that I hope this committee will investigate it next year and if they will investigate it thoroughly I believe they will see that this program should be cut to somewhere in the neighborhood of where it was before it was changed over to a WPA project and

jumped up in 1 year from $600,000 to $2,400,000.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I am a member of the subcommittee and I am vitally interested in this matter. I think I can speak for the chairman of our subcommittee. I think I can state that this subcommittee will not let down in its efforts to secure the maximum value out of every tax dollar that is spent.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Certainly I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. Each and every year we have had a complete investigation of this. I think we have scaled down the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine as far as possible. We investigated this matter this year, and next year we will investigate to see whether they have carried out the recommendations that we made this year.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I certainly want to commend both of these gentlemen. They are both very able men and men who have the best interests of this country at heart. I know that. I am glad to see it, but I feel this way about this supervisory cost, that a supervisory cost which is one dollar for every two dollars and a half spent for work in the field is too high and ought to be cut. There is just no argument about that in my book, and that is why I offered this amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. We certainly are not trying to justify any such expenditure for supervision, but it is the belief of the committee that the gentleman is wrong since it is provided in the report that this money will go into the work in the field.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Will the gentleman just let me read. The question was asked this man about this particular item of $705,000 which I sought to cut.

Mr. STIGLER asked him on page 1089:

Mr. STIGLER. Let me ask, what work do you do under the heading there, 2 (a), which you show as leadership, coordination, and technical direction of white pine blister control? That is on page 317.

Mr. Granger did not answer it, but asked Dr. Popham if he would answer it.

Dr. Popham said:

That item provides for the over-all coordination of blister rust control between the several agencies that participate.

Mr. STIGLER. How many agencies participate in that?

Dr. POPHAM. There are three bureaus of the Department of the Interior, the Forest Service, the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, the States and the private landowners.

There is a small staff that works with these agencies in the over-all planning, selecting the territories to receive priority, dividing the funds according to needs, establishing standards for work, and providing general technical direction of the work.

They also check to see that standards are met, for determining in the field which areas should be worked first and which should receive a follow-up inspection later on.

As you are aware, white pine blister rust is conducted both on State and private land, and on Federal lands, falling under the management of the several Federal agencies.

That is what the expert himself stated; that is all the justification that is given for this $705,000, and verifies what I said about it.

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes, but the committee report was written after the hearings which the gentleman quotes. I do not want the record to be left that the subcommittee or the full committee will agree to let them spend that much money.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. As I said, I am sure the gentleman's intentions are of the very best, and I am not criticizing them, but the fact remains that this appropriation of $705,000 goes for a supervisory purpose and constitutes a ratio of one dollar to two and a half of the money spent. I am firmly convinced now, as I have always been, that it is too high.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ENGLE: On page 22, line 7, strike out the period and add the following: "and of which $1,351,149.37 shall be used to pay the claims recognized by the act of December 29, 1950."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the paragraph to which offered, that it is not authorized by law, and that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to earmark $1,350,000 which is money illegally taken away from the western counties by the Forest Service. That money was due to these counties under the Forest Management Act of May 23, 1908, which provides that 25 percent of all moneys received during any fiscal year from each national forest shall be paid at the end of the year to the State in which the national forest is situated, to be expended as the State legislatures may prescribe for the benefit of public schools and public lands of the county or counties in which the national forest is situated.

The forest management people deprived these counties of this 25 percent or a portion of it, amounting to $1,350,000. What I propose to do on page 22 of this bill is to earmark $1,350,000 of the funds allocated to forest management, which amounts to $27,122,000.

Mr. Chairman, the people who handled forest management illegally and improperly diverted this fund. This amendment seeks restitution for those counties which are deprived of that money; it seeks restitution in the only section where we can get restitution against that Federal agency which improperly diverted the funds, namely Forest Management.

I contend, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that if there is any place in the bill where restitution can be made it must be made from the funds of the agency which improperly and illegally diverted the funds, namely the National Forest Management Division, and that is the reason this amendment is offered at this point in the bill.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. I may say to the gentleman from New York this earmarking is authorized by law, because the Congress a year ago in an act authorized the payment of these funds to the State as reimbursement for money that had been illegally diverted.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, it is not in the slightest degree germane to the item that is here under consideration. There is nothing in the nature of a payment of anything to anybody under that statute in this paragraph. It is, therefore, not in the slightest degree germane.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FORAND). The Chair is ready to rule.

The paragraph to which the amendment is offered makes an appropriation for specific purposes, namely, for the "administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement, and development of the national forests," thus the paragraph provides money for narrowly defined use only on national forests, which belong to the Federal Government.

The amendment in question seeks to make available a part of this appropriation for a purpose entirely different from the purposes spelled out in the paragraph of the bill. The amendment refers to moneys received from each national forest as set out in title 16, section 500, United States Code, which provides in part that "25 percent of all moneys received during any fiscal year from each national forest shall be paid, at the end of such year, by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State in which such national forest is situated, to be expended as the State Legislature may prescribe for the benefit of the public schools and public roads of the county or counties in which such national forest is situated," and so forth. The amendment would make the funds in this bill available to pay States the percentage above referred to, and the payments could be used by the States only for public roads and public schools. Regardless of the use to which the States could put the money, the payment of claims to States as outlined above is in no wise germane to the administration, protection, et cetera, of national forests. Building State roads and schools is even further remote from expenditures on Federal forests.

In keeping with the many precedents of the House holding that an amendment must be germane to the paragraph to which offered, the Chair must rule that this amendment is not germane, and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, of the 435 congressional districts in the United States, the one having the most timber is that of my friend, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH]. My own district, which comprises most of the seacoast and Columbia River counties of Washington

has more standing timber than any district except the one represented by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH]. I, therefore, am familiar with the timber problems now under debate.

The great cost of managing our public timber is primarily the result of having too many cooks. The Federal Government now has 16 agencies engaged in timber management. In many cases these agencies are doing duplicating and overlapping work and the result is waste of Federal funds and additional unnecessary tax burdens on the people.

In my county—Grays Harbor—there is a small lake 2 miles wide by 6 miles long. Three different Federal agencies are managing the Federal timber that stands on the borders of that lake. Many times, I have seen Government-owned automobiles of the Forest Service, the Park Service and the Indian Service all parked at one time around a swank hotel on the border of that lake. These cars had brought employees of three different Federal agencies to this hotel to attend to timber problems of the adjacent area. One agency could do the job better than three and do it at much less cost to the taxpayers.

This duplication of effort by overlapping and duplicating agencies is one of the main reasons why the management of our forests costs as much money as it does.

Now, the rules and regulations promulgated by these different overlapping agencies sometimes are most wondrous to behold.

For example, in one place a narrow 24-foot road separates timber that is managed by the Park Service and managed by the Forest Service. The Park Service has a rule which says that if a hunter kills a cougar—mountain lion—in park lands, he is subject to a fine or imprisonment, or both, for destroying wildlife in a national park. But, if the cougar crosses that narrow road and gets into the Forest Service timber and a hunter kills him there, that hunter is not fined nor imprisoned—he is entitled to a $15 bounty for having destroyed a predatory animal.

The Forest Service is charged with the responsibility of marketing federally owned timber, the selling of it to commercial establishments. But, while doing this, it operates a large recreational agency, establishes and operates parks, playgrounds, and camp sites.

The Park Service is supposed to devote itself to providing recreational facilities but it also has a large agency engaged in the sale of Federal timber.

This is a wasteful duplication of effort and a costly one to the taxpayers.

I hope that sometime Congress will take some action to eliminate some of these unnecessary 16 agencies now engaged in administering our Federal timber. If Congress does that, it will save much confusion and also large sums of money for the taxpayers.

The Forest Service, on the whole, does a very creditable and efficient job in administering the Federal timber under its jurisdiction. I do not think the Park Service does.

In my state, the Park Service, for example, obtained the creation of a park that is larger than the State of Rhode Island. This park contains 17,000,000,000 feet of standing timber. This timber, according to the Assistant United States Forester, if sold at today's price, would bring $423,000,000.

Now, we in our area want a national park to preserve timber for future generations to see. We want a big park. But, having a park larger than the State of Rhode Island containing $423,000,000 of merchandisable timber, is too much of a good thing. It is downright absurd, ridiculous, and asinine. It is asinine because some of this timber is overripe and ought to be logged and put to useful purposes and thereby be producing revenues for the Federal Government.

The Park Service, however, has a starry-eyed theory that this timber, even the overripe timber, should never be cut for use. They have a theory that it should be permitted to die, fall to the ground and rot. This, they say, will fertilize the ground for a new crop. I have never heard anyone at all familiar with trees agree with this absurd theory.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want to commend the able gentleman for the splendid and informative statement he just made. He has directed our attention again to some of the many places in our Government where we have duplication and multiplication of effort which results in higher taxes against the people of this country. The policy presently prevents our accomplishing a very important objective he has pointed out. It ought to be corrected. I hope the House will follow the advice of the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

Weeks Act

For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U. S. C. 513–519, 521), $100,000, to be available only for payment toward the purchase price of any lands acquired, including the cost of surveys in connection with such acquisition: *Provided*, That no part of such funds shall be used for the purchase of lands in the counties of Adair, Cherokee, and Sequoyah, in the State of Oklahoma, without the specific approval of the board of county commissioners of the county in which such lands are situated.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

Page 24, line 10, strike out "$100,000" and insert "$50,000."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would not undertake to vie with the fine gentleman from Mississippi in either knowledge of this bill or any attempts at economy. I think the committee has done a fine job in making numerous cuts on this appropriation, all of which could be well and can be well justified. There are other cuts, I think, that might be well justified. The amendment I am offering is one of them. The thing that is bothering me and a great many of us here in Congress and throughout the country is that here we have these appropriation bills coming up every day, many of them, in fact nearly all of them where the agencies of the Government are asking for larger appropriations of the people's money, and at the same time that we are sitting here voting away this money the Committee on Ways and Means is sitting over in another chamber and almost daily putting out reports of votes that have been taken that will lead to more and more and more taxes upon the already heavily burdened people of this country. And some of us are worried about it. We are worried not only because of the burden upon the people; we are worried because we believe these increases in taxation are going to diminish the source of the revenues of the Government by putting them so high that people are now saying, "Well, what is the use of me trying to do anything? What is the use of trying to make any money if the Congress is going to take it away from us in taxes and the Congress is going to appropriate money to fritter away in unnecessary activities and expenditures?" Now, that is the thing that has been activating this House in past weeks in trying to cut these appropriation bills. This particular amendment that I am offering is in relation to the acquisition of land. This amendment proposes to cut from $100,000 to $50,000 for the acquisition of land for the Forest Service. I am wondering in this time of stress why is it necessary to buy any more land for the Forest Service? Can we not put that off for a year or two? Why do we have to have any more land now for the Forest Service? I am wondering why the committee allowed any funds for the purchase of land. I know I have just recently heard that the Federal Government with its various agencies now owns over 8 percent of the land of my State of Virginia. I just heard the gentleman from California within the last hour stand on this floor of this House and say that the Federal Government owns 40 percent of all the land in the great State of California.

In this time of emergency can we not stop, look, and listen, and wait for a year or two before we buy any more land? I am simply asking you to cut this appropriation from $100,000 to $50,000, and just say to this agency. "If you have to buy some land, just wait for a year or two until some of these desperate emergencies are over, and then come back and tell us about it again."

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it so happens that I am a member of the commission consisting of three Members from the House and three from the Senate that passes on the purchase of these tracts of land that are acquired by the Forest Service under the Weeks law and other laws. I reviewed the purchase of several of these

tracts in the last year. This particular appropriation under the Weeks law in 1950 was roughly $400,000, last year $250,000, and this year is $100,000. If you will turn to page 477 of the hearings you will find why we acquired these particular tracts, which is the question the gentleman just before me asked.

The tracts we acquired this year were, every one of them, small areas inside present national forests, a few acres here and a few acres somewhere else, that were needed because they represented a fire hazard in several instances inside of national forest tracts. Another area was acquired because unsightly signs were being put up that detracted from the rest of the national forests.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman says we are going to spend this money because somebody has put an unsightly sign up on some private property. In this time of great emergency when we are spending every dollar we can save, is that a justification for buying more land?

Mr. D'EWART. I think it may well be the justification for acquiring a 5- or 10-acre tract that costs from $8 to $10 or perhaps less per acre.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. It so happens that I, too, am a member of that commission, from the House. I just wanted to say that what the gentleman has said is largely true. I have been a member of that commission now for the past decade or such a matter. It has been the policy of that commission during the past several years, I will say, and it has certainly been definitely my policy as a member of that commission, not to buy extensive tracts of land. The only purpose I can see now as justification for any appropriation at all on this subject is to fill in these isolated spots that are owned by private people, so that the Government's holdings may become solid and contiguous.

The question of whether it could stand an additional $50,000 cut or not is of course a question for the House to pass upon. I think the commission should have some money with which to make these small purchases. As the gentleman knows and as the proponent of this amendment knows, I am very much in favor of cutting these appropriations wherever we possibly can. I certainly agree not only with what the gentleman from Montana has said but what the gentleman from Virginia has said, that we ought to defer as many of these matters as possible. If the House thinks they can get along with a $50,000 cut from the rather small appropriation that the committee has recommended, it will be perfectly agreeable with me.

Mr. D'EWART. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman has been on this commission longer than I have. I concur in what he has said. I can assure the gentleman from Virginia that we examine every one of these purchases very carefully and if it is not very definitely in the public interest, to purchase a small tract, we turn it down. We need this small amount of money to protect the present holding. If it is not in the public interest and if it does not protect present holdings, certainly we turn them down. As the previous speaker said, if it is the will of the Congress that we should not make these purchases, that is the privilege of the Congress. But I think the money we do spend on the tracts are necessary in the public interest and to protect the present holdings.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to call the attention of the Congress to the fact that in 1950, the last full fiscal year, the total expenditures including supplies, materials, travel, equipment, and all that sort of thing, amounted to only $66,000, and if we cannot save $16,000 out of $66,000 it certainly is too bad.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should have made a pro forma amendment because the gentleman's amendment is in the direction that I have gone during the past several years. It is just a case of how many of these situations will arise. For instance, in 1947 the appropriation for this purpose was $2,593,000. In 1948 it was $1,000,000, and in 1951, last year, the budget estimate was $700,000, and we cut it down and we held the other body to $300,000. This year we cut it from $300,000 to $100,000. The gentleman from Virginia is just going a step faster than the committee has been willing to go. The reason for the attitude of the committee is we feel we already have too much land. But the Department does make a case each year for the purchase of small isolated tracts within a national forest, which are privately owned, where a man has the right to have his house and camp and do all those things which create a fire hazard. Last year in the conference report I insisted, and I expect to insist on it again this year, that they could not spend this for any land which was not entirely surrounded by a national forest. And if there is $100,000 worth of that kind of land, the chances are it will be a good investment. It will be a gain if we can reduce the cost of fire protection required.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. Has his committee ever considered doing anything to stop the Forest Service from expanding its total ownership by a system of exchanges wherein it exchanges the cutting rights on lands it now has for the fee title for lands which it does not own but which come off the tax rolls after it has title? That is by all odds the biggest loophole. We can stop the appropriations. We can cut it from $100,000 to $50,000 or make any other cut, but so far as I know there is no way to stop the Forest Service from trading stumpage it has for the fee title to land which it does not now own but which when it takes over immediately goes on the tax rolls. So I ask the gentleman, is there anything being done to stop that kind of exchange procedure which is expanding the ownership in the national forests?

Mr. WHITTEN. This is a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, and we are not supposed to do anything except appropriate funds. Every once in a while we find a situation like that and we get a little criticism here for trying to correct it, because it take a little legislation.

I will say to the gentleman I have just recently had a report from the Comptroller General as to what has been going on in the Forest Service in that regard. It came in only in the last 10 days, but even had I had it earlier, I do not know how we could have reached it in an appropriation bill.

Mr. ENGLE. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, is the gentleman not interested in the fact that when the Forest Service trades stumpage in a national forest for a fee title to land, that money is not coming into the United States Treasury, and therefore it is necessary for the gentleman and his subcommittee to put up more money in order to take care of their operation?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am very much interested in what the gentleman says. I am sure that from time to time other members on the Appropriations Committee feel like myself, that we would like to be on legislative committees. I would like to be on a legislative committee for about 3 weeks, and I think I could correct some of these things, but we cannot do it here.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. It is my understanding from Mr. Hopkins that these exchanges were made to solidify and that they were acre-for-acre exchanges. I would like to have the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] or the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] verify that.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I think as far as I am concerned that I have already made that statement, that the purpose of the Commission in the past several years has been only to make purchases to solidify holdings that they already have. That is, to take in these isolated pieces of land owned privately that become fire hazards, and so on. So far as my friend and colleague from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is concerned, I at least want to share credit for whatever has been cut down in that, because as a member of the Commission I have advocated that as the policy of the Commission all the way through.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for one additional minute in order to yield to the gentleman from Montana.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. This Weeks' law money is used only east of the Mississippi River. It is used to consolidate acquired forests. That is, the forests that were purchased by the National Government east of the Mississippi River. None of this money goes west of the Mississippi, and therefore it is not applicable to grazing land, as was mentioned by the gentleman from California.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. From the discussion it appears that the issue is whether we can defer the purchase of these lands, practically, until the emergency is over. I wonder if the gentleman recalls to what extent those purchases were made during the last emergency, World War II.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not have the figures, but this committee has cut it down since 1947 from $2,493,000 to about $100,000. Where a man has a few acres of land in a national forest, where he can have cabins and buildings which create a fire hazard, it will usually cost a great deal more than that to take care of the fire hazard.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I am not speaking to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia, yet I do feel that it is timely that we should make note of the receipts coming into the Federal Treasury from our national forests.

I note that the appropriation for the running of the national forests for the fiscal year 1951, is as follows:

For protection and management (money for making timber sales $4,500,000) maintenance of improvements, etc	$27,122,025
Forest fire fighting	6,000,000
Forest roads and trails	10,437,500
Range improvement	700,000
Total to run forests	44,259,525

The anticipated income from the national forests for 1951, is as follows:

Sale of timber	$45,000,000
From grazing fees, special uses and other miscellaneous uses	5,000,000
Total gross receipts	50,0000,000

These figures are extremely interesting to me, Mr. Chairman. If we do not impair the program there will be a net return to the Federal Treasury of approximately $5,000,000 over the appropriations for the running of our national forests.

Of the total for the fiscal year 1951 between $40,000,000 and $45,000,000 is expected to be received from the sale of timber. This will be an increase from slightly over $29,000,000 in the fiscal year 1950. The rapidity of the growth of receipts is shown by the fact that the receipts for the fiscal year 1940 were $5,859,000; those for 1945 slightly over $16,000,000 as compared with anticipated receipts for the fiscal year 1951 of $50,000,000.

There are some national forests which will probably never pay their own way. They were established primarily for watershed protection, such as in southern California, and have limited revenue-producing resources. Generally, however, rapid progress is being made in having the national forests support themselves. For the fiscal year 1950, out of 152 national forests 57 were paying their own way as far as the appropriation is concerned which provides for their protection and management. On 28 national forests the receipts were in excess of all expenditures including those for permanent investments such as roads, trails, reforestation, and range revegetation.

For the current fiscal year, the receipts per thousand board feet for timber sold are almost 10 times the direct cost of handling the sale of 1,000 board feet of timber.

The basic situation is that experience clearly shows that investment of more money each year in the administration of the national forests produces additional receipts much larger than the additional expenditure.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, we should not lose sight of the fact of the financial returns to the States. Of the total gross receipts the Federal Government returns 25 percent to the States for distribution to the counties in which the national forests are located to be used for roads and schools. Another 10 percent is made available to the Forest Service to pay part of the costs of building and maintaining roads and trails in the national forests.

I commend the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. WHITTEN] and each member of the committee in their desire to not only hold the line but to maintain an increasing vision of the tremendous possibilities that are represented in our national forests.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Virginia) there were—ayes 53, noes, 48.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Superior National Forest

For the acquisition of forest land within the Superior National Forest, Minn., under the provisions of the act approved June 22, 1948 (Public Law 733), $100,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Page 24, line 22, strike out "$100,000" and insert "$50,000."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this is merely the companion amendment to the one just adopted by the House. There are two items in here for the acquisition of land each in the amount of $100,000. You will find them here on page 24, one under the Weeks Act and one under the general appropriations. My companion amendments propose to cut each of them $50,000.

I ask for a vote on the amendment.

[Mr. DEMPSEY addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

(Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I want to subscribe to the excellent train of thought injected by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY]. I know that the gentleman who has offered the amendment to reduce this appropriation by $50,000 is sincere, but I do plead with the membership to give this their serious consideration.

The area involved is a wilderness roadless area, it was established as a wilderness area by action taken by this House itself. Furthermore it was implemented by the executive department this year through Executive order which provided that no airplane shall fly over this area.

There are scattered parcels of privately owned land throughout this large consolidated national forest in my district. This consolidation has been under way now for the past 3 years to pick up the small private holdings and consolidate the entire area into a wilderness area.

Mr. Chairman, the adoption of the pending amendment would be a great injustice here, it would be a very unwise move, it would really be a penny-wise-pound-foolish policy. You have private holders up there who are willing to sell, who have been led to believe they will be allowed to exchange their lands or sell out to the Government. Now you have them out on a limb where they cannot build roads to reach the resort areas or private establishments up there. It has been provided by this Congress that the private owners cannot build roads to reach these areas. The only way left is by airplane, and the executive department has told them that they cannot go to their property by airplane. Now we come in here and reverse ourselves and say, "Now, we are not going to buy your property," which we indicated 3 years ago we would do by authorizing $500,000 for acquisition of these private lands.

I plead with you here to be consistent with the policy which we ourselves established 3 years ago. We appropriate $100,000 each year of the original $500,000 authorization, so a period of 5 or 6 years will be necessary to complete the purchases of the few remaining pieces of privately owned property in this national forest.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. When this point came up in the subcommittee, the subcommittee members were kind enough to ask me as to what I thought about this particular amount of $150,000 requested by the budget for this year's installment. I told them at the time that I thought it should take its cut along with other portions of the bill and I suggested that we put $100,000 into the bill instead of the $150,000. In other words, that day I was perfectly willing to take our share of the cut which I thought we should put into the bill, and I do feel that lowering this yet another $50,000, lowering it by two-thirds, will be just a little bit unfair to the previous almost unanimous action of the committee.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman. It would be unfair to these people who now come, after great reluctance, have yielded to the wishes of the Government and are prepared to sell out; have curtailed all plans for any resort business this summer; are prepared to move out just as soon as the moneys are available so the purchase can be made. They have no use of the property now, their own Government denying them the right of access to their own property, and being unable to sell to the Forest Service. Gentlemen, I do urge your most earnest consideration of this matter.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as I said a few moments ago, I represent one of the largest timber districts of the United States. I said that the Forest Service is a good and efficient agency, in my opinion. I regard myself as a friend of the Forest Service. Yet, while I am a friend of the Forest Service, I believe we should make this $50,000 reduction.

This amount of money involved is not great, but by adopting this $50,000 reduction we, the Members of Congress, will be saying to the executive departments of the Government that the Congress is unalterably opposed to the constant efforts of these Federal agencies to constantly gaining ownership of more and more land by acquiring additional blocks of private holdings and placing them under Federal governmental ownership and control.

At the present time, 35 percent of all the lands in the State of Washington are owned by the Federal Government. The Federal Government owns almost 46 percent of all the land in California and owns more than 52 percent of all the land area of Oregon.

Of all the landed area of Nevada, the Federal Government owns nearly 85 percent and barely more than 15 percent is in private ownership.

The Federal Government now owns 54.31 percent of all the land in the 10 western States of this Nation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman, of course, realizes that this particular item was specifically authorized in a separate act by the Congress of the United States. It is not an action by the Forest Service, I may say to the gentleman.

In one area of my district, known as the North Shore of Lake Quinault, the Park Service wants to acquire about 10,000 acres of land that is occupied mostly by pioneer settlers of the area. It has been employing almost Hitler and Stalin tactics to drive these settlers off their farms so that it, the Park Service, may acquire the land. The Park Service has not kept the roads in decent or safe repair. The settlers have difficulty driving their cars to town or getting their children to school in busses because of the unsafe condition of the roads through federally owned park property.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. There is no expansion here. There are well defined limits to the Superior National Forest established by the Congress itself. The Congress itself here 3 years ago made available these annual payments of around $100,000 to acquire these small remaining private properties within that area and has ordered the Forest Service to go ahead and consolidate them for greater efficiency and economy. The separate private properties constitute an additional fire hazard in several instances, which compels us to spend additional moneys for fire protection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. May I say to the gentleman from Minnesota, we should acquire that land, if it is needed, as suggested by the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] by trades rather than by spending taxpayers' money in acquiring additional property.

Mr. BLATNIK. They are doing both.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of California. May I say to the gentleman from Washington that those of us from the West have a pretty good idea of what the gentleman is talking about. I am in thorough accord with the gentleman in his premise that exchanges are the answer to this problem, and not the acquisition of additional land by the Federal Government, which already holds far too much.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Sometime this Congress ought to express itself as being determined to put an end to the insatiable greed of these Federal agencies which always are pressing to acquire more and more private lands and bring them under Federal ownership and control. The Federal Government already owns too much land, particularly in the West.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. I think the gentleman misunderstood me. I am against the expanison of Federal ownership, but I would not be in favor of using the exchange developments here. That would do just exactly the opposite of what the gentleman has in mind. I should like to make the RECORD clear that I do not think the example is applicable in this instance.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in this day when it is extremely popular to offer amendments to whatever hits the floor, it is a little difficult to get up here and speak in each instance against the amendment. Nobody is more disturbed about the amount of land the Federal Government owns, than I am, and I have written provisions in years past which would prohibit the buying of any more land in my area. But because that is true and because it is exceedingly popular to cut down whatever is in a bill, I do not think we should lose sight of why this amount is in here and what it is for.

This Congress passed a bill providing for the Superior National Forest, and we have provided money to get it started. They have already acquired a lot of the land, but inside of it there still are a few pieces of privately owned land which increase the annual expense of keeping out forest fires and other things that may be of danger. The longer you wait to get this land the more it is going to cost you, according to everything that has happened in the last few years. If you do not want the national forest in the Superior area you should not have passed it. Having passed it, it is common sense to get the job over with rather than to drag it out.

I will agree with the good intentions of my friend from Virginia, but to prolong a thing you are committed to and are going to do does not save a dime. I think it will cost you money in this instance, just as in the amendment that was adopted a while ago. If you want to repeal some of these laws, repeal them, but if you are going to have them, let us have a little economy in the operation of them. To wait several years to buy this land that you are committed to buy does not necessarily save a dime but, as I said, we think it will cost you money.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. It is economy to appropriate this money at the present time, as was mentioned by the chairman of the subcommittee, because all these little tracts are being improved unwittingly by the people that own these tracts within this roadless area. Therefore, the more improvements they put on those tracts the more it is going to cost the Government when it comes time to purchase them. On top of that, you have a road condition to maintain, you have a fire hazard, and you have the sale of property to other people who come in there not knowing that the property is subject to being taken over at some time

by the Forest Service. People who purchase land as a speculative matter or as an ownership matter do not always realize that this Congress has passed laws to provide for a roadless area to take over that territory. It is extremely good economy to make this appropriation now and proceed with the act the Congress has placed on the statute books.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentlemen who have addressed the House have been kind enough to speak respectfully, to say the least, of our subcommittee. But you leave us where we do not know what to do. If, without regard to why the money is here, it is just a case of cutting each item that comes up, you are going to do a lot of damage to the program of this Department. I will vote a bill requiring the Federal Government to get rid of half of its land, or even more. But as long as you have a great deal of land with some privately owned land inside of it, where you must give them the right of ingress and egress, it is unsound business just for the sake of a record vote here to cut this amount of money.

[Mr. HOPE addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the amendment that has been offered will serve the purpose of bringing about the results that are expected by the gentlemen who are sponsoring the amendment. However, I do wish that there were some legislation that would afford the Government the same right to sell land as they have to purchase land. I do not know that it could be put in an appropriation bill. I am sure it would be declared legislation upon an appropriation bill, but it does seem to me that if the Federal Government has authority to purchase land, they should likewise have authority to sell land.

Several years ago the Caddo River Lumber Co. was operating in my district. They were a commercial lumber company. They sold thousands of acres of land to the Ozark and Ouchita National Parks. When the Government was buying that land they bought a lot of city lots upon which there is not one stick of timber and never will be. They are city lots, I tell you. Still the Federal Government is not authorized to sell those city lots to the people who live there in the cities involved.

There is a lot of good farm land among this land that was sold by the timber company to the Federal Government, and even though the Forestry Department would like to sell that land to the public, they are not allowed to do so. The only thing they can do is to swap land. I can prove by every person connected with the Forestry Department that when you start swapping land with private people you get into a lot of trouble, because every person feels that his neighbor has been treated better than he has been treated when dealing with the Federal Government.

I am hopeful that the Committee on Agriculture will bring forth some legislation that will authorize the Federal Government to sell some of this land, even if it is necessary to use the money received from that sale to purchase additional lands.

I do not think this amendment will serve any purpose. What you are doing is this: You are curtailing the moneys available now with which to buy land out in some particular forest area. If you cut this money in half they will simply buy half of it this year and half of it next year, and I cannot see where you will save a dime by telling them you have to purchase it over a 2-year period instead of over a 1-year period.

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Virginia), there were—ayes 30, noes 55.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Special acts

For the acquisition of land to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior boundaries of the following national forests, in accordance with the provisions of the following acts authorizing annual appropriations of forest receipts for such purposes, and in not to exceed the following amounts from such receipts: Uinta and Wasatch National Forests, Utah, act of August 26, 1935 (Public Law 337), as amended, $40,000; Cache National Forest, Utah, act of May 11, 1938 (Public Law 505), as amended, $10,000; San Bernardino and Cleveland National Forests, Riverside County, Calif., act of June 15, 1938 (Public Law 634), as amended, $22,000; Nevada and Toiyabe National Forests, Nev., act of June 25 1938 (Public Law 748), as amended, $10,000; Angeles National Forest, Calif., act of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 591), $20,000; Cleveland National Forest, San Diego County, Calif., act of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 589), $5,000; Sequoia National Forest, Calif., act of June 17, 1940 (Public Law 637), $35,000; in all $142,000.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that any remarks I have made today in the Committee of the Whole be expunged from the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

UNITED NATIONS BETRAYED US

Mr. Chairman, while we are attempting to economize, let us take a look at the United Nations, which has been receiving so much of our money.

Those who put their trust either for permanent universal peace or our own national security in the United Nations should learn some of the present-day "facts of life."

Over the years, time and again from the well of the House, by news releases and public talks, I have opposed the surrendering of our independence, the policy of letting the welfare of our people and the future security of our Republic, be determined by a group of individuals whose first consideration is the advancement of their own individual or national interests.

This week Secretary of Defense Marshall, no doubt inadvertently, disclosed the folly of relying upon the United Nations for our own protection or the advancement of our welfare.

David Lawrence, commenting upon the general's testimony, wrote as follows:

UNITED STATES SURRENDERED INDEPENDENCE—GENERAL MARSHALL'S TESTIMONY SHOWS 350,000 SOLDIERS WERE ABANDONED TO WHIM OF FOREIGN CABINETS

(By David Lawrence)

Secretary Marshall's testimony is in many respects even more sensational than that of General MacArthur.

For it tells the American people for the first time that they have completely lost their independence of military action in the midst of a war in which 350,000 American boys are engaged.

It tells that decisions made by the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State and the Joint Chiefs of Staff are vetoed in secret by other governments without an opportunity for the public opinion of the United States or of the world to be apprised of the facts.

It tells that, although the United States has contributed the bulk of the troops in Korea, the 13 governments which have contributed token forces decided to deny us the right to apply the military doctrine of pursuing the enemy—known as "hot pursuit."

It tell that the United Nations has appointed the United States as agent to conduct the military operations but that the agent cannot perform those military operations without continuously obtaining the consent of these Allies.

It tells that the United States, though conscious of the importance of an economic blockade to stop strategic materials and munitions from getting to the enemy, has not succeeded in persuading the principal UN countries now involved in that trade to stop it, even though 10 months of war in Korea have elapsed.

It tells that all these troubles and friction between the United States and its Allies were never communicated to General MacArthur except in the vaguest terms.

It tells, by implication, that the famous 13-nation declaration which was supposed to bring about a negotiation of a "cease fire" was never sent to General MacArthur and that only a brief message saying some such announcement was planned went to him on March 20 last.

It tells that the United States Government at present opposes the entry of Red China into the UN and opposes turning Formosa over to Communist China but that the United States Government is nevertheless willing to discuss these subjects as matters for negotiation with the Red Chinese when they agree to a cease fire.

It tells that the United States will adhere to that policy but it doesn't tell whether the United States will use its veto to turn down such a reward for aggression or will merely bow to the will of the UN countries eventually, as it has done on some of the military measures proposed to the UN.

It tells that General MacArthur carried out his military instructions as Far East commander and did not violate any military

orders but that his public statements—his letter answering a Member of Congress, Representative MARTIN, and his interviews answering questions that were asked by the press concerning military operations—were distasteful to the President and his advisers and really caused his dismissal.

It tells that only four men sat is with President Truman and recommended summary dismissal of General MacArthur—Messrs. Acheson, Harriman, Bradley, and Marshall.

It tells that the Joint Chiefs favored a replacement but did not have anything to do with the form of dismissal. It doesn't tell whether the Joint Chiefs were told that the President was displeased with General MacArthur's statements and was considering a change in command.

It tells that the summary dismissal was decided on suddenly as a means of preventing General MacArthur from making any further statements to the press and from developing a sort of cumulative affair of publicity. This has since come about anyway with probably more cumulative statements and hearings than anybody ever imagined.

It tells that the Secretary of Defense of the United States does not believe the enemy can be driven out of Korea, but he hopes they will withdraw after their offensives fail. He doesn't think bombardment of Manchurian bases will chase them out either, though he concedes that diversionary operations such as a blockade and other military efforts in Southeast Asia may cause them to tire of their effort to stay in Korea.

It tells that in a moment of great crisis—when MacArthur's troops were being pushed back last December after Red China entered the war—the UN allies became frightened and began to limit the operations of the UN troops, especially in fighting back in the air.

It tells that instructions went to General MacArthur forbidding him to bomb even two big distributing centers in North Korea which were 35 miles below the northern border of the country and well within Korea itself.

It tells that, despite General MacArthur's titles as Supreme Commander in Japan and UN Commander and Commander in Chief of the far eastern forces, Secretary Marshall regarded General MacArthur as just another local theater commander, without the latitude of expression to comment on military events that General Eisenhower had or Admiral Nimitz had or General MacArthur himself had during the last war, and without even the right to engage in psychological warfare in his own theater of action because it might offend UN allies.

There are many more things revealed, the significance of which will become apparent as the hearings continue. But none is more vital than the revelation that America, although contributing the bulk of the military forces and the supplies, has surrendered her independence of action and her leadership and has abandoned 350,000 American boys to the whim of foreign cabinets.

Another recent disclosure goes, if that is possible, a little further.

Here we are in a war declared by President Truman, apparently at the instigation of the United Nations. Great Britain is a member of that organization, as are France and others of our nominal paper allies; yet just recently we learned that the British colonial office confessed that in the 9 months ending in March, British Malaya sold 121 tons of rubber to Communist China and that 40,400 more tons went direct to Russia.

We also learned, still later, that Britain does not propose to cut out the shipping of rubber to Communist China. That rubber is being used to aid the Communists to kill our men who are being conscripted to fight in Korea. Yet we continue to conscript our men to fight in the Far East, while we conscript our tax dollars to aid the nations which are aiding the Communists to kill the men we send abroad.

Just how foolish, inconsistent, and cruel to our people will we continue to be? Is it not time that people, generally, give a little thought to our own national welfare, and insist that they will no longer send their men to be killed by people we are aiding with our dollars?

From the Chicago Tribune of May 7 comes an editorial on this situation, which reads as follows:

BRITISH RUBBER: FRAUD AND BETRAYAL

The British colonial office has confessed that in the 9 months ending in March British Malaya sold 120,000 tons of rubber to Communist China and 40,400 more tons direct to Russia. During all this period token British detachments were fighting in Korea, and during the later months, fighting there against Chinese Communists.

This is a lot of rubber. It is a sixth of what the United States, with its tens of millions of automobiles, uses in a normal year, and a still higher proportion of its use of natural rubber. The Chinese got only 27,500 tons from Malaya in 1949. It is almost a certainty that their increased purchases were transshipped to Stalin. The Malayan sales alone are probably a year's supply for Russia, where rubber goes exclusively to the war machine.

These sales to Communists were made during a period when rubber prices were advancing by leaps and bounds. They stood at 18½ cents a pound at the beginning of 1950, and rose as high as 80 cents. Trading has been suspended in New York because the Government is now the sole buyer of imported rubber.

There are other than military aspects to this matter. John L. Collyer, president of the B. F. Goodrich Co., called attention last August to the diversion of rubber to the Communists. He commented Friday on the admissions 2 days earlier of the British colonial office, saying:

"It is important for rubber consumers, of which the United States is by far the largest, to know if British Malaya is actually encouraging the sale of rubber to Russia, China and other iron curtain countries for the purpose of keeping the world crude rubber price high. * * * It would be of interest to all free peoples to know how Malaya is being paid for the huge amounts of rubber moving into China since the Korean War. At an average price of 70 cents a pound, the 120,000 tons of rubber purchased by China in recent months would cost approximately $168,000,000. In view of the known inflation and the lack of gold in China, payment poses an interesting question.

"Does a sub rosa cartel of crude rubber producers exist, using iron-curtain countries as a wedge to create and maintain highly inflated rubber prices?"

Mr. Collyer suspects that the British in Malaya are not merely providing our enemies with an essential war material that they cannot find in appreciable quantities in their own territories, but are giving it to them at dump prices or on credit, to gouge American and European rubber purchasers by limiting supplies.

The selfishness of Malayan and Indonesian rubber planters almost inflicted defeat on the United States and its allies a decade ago. In the face of frantic efforts by the United States to stockpile rubber in 1940 and 1941, they withheld vast supplies, which eventually fell into the hands of Japanese. Only the miracle of synthetic rubber production saved this Nation.

The Truman administration has kept control of the synthetic rubber plants. Despite its proclaimed war emergency, it was slow to reactivate them last year. The administration has also been lax in pushing the construction of plants to make the new "cold" rubber, which is the best synthetic for automobile tires. Mr. Acheson's acknowledged position as the spokesman for British interests in the Truman Cabinet raises the question whether, to oblige Downing Street and garner dollars for the crude-rubber monopoly, American synthetic production has not been held down deliberately.

Aneurin Bevan and his left-wing followers in the British Labor Party are seeking to capitalize on resentment against the United States, based upon charges that American war production and stockpiling are depriving the British of raw materials, forcing up their costs, and crippling their industrial production. It] ppens that the two commodities on which prices have increased most are tin, which is controlled by the British, and rubber.

The British trade with the enemy, reducing the supply of rubber in order to gouge us with inflated prices. Then they blame the United States. The next and obvious move, already indicated by some of Mobilization Director Wilson's tender sentiments toward the Europeans, will be to demand that we pay them for using their own rubber, at the prices they have deliberately inflated.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The Clerk read as follows:

COOPERATIVE RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious plants on national forests, as authorized by section 12 of the act of April 24, 1950 (Public Law 478), $700,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That hereafter no part of the appropriation for "Cooperative Range Improvements" shall be expended in any national forest until funds or other contributions at least equal to such expenditures are made available by States or other local public or private sources, except that claims recognized by the act of December 29, 1950, shall be accepted as contributions for the purposes of this section.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the following language beginning in line 18 on page 26 and including the proviso in lines 18 to 25 inclusive as being legislation on an appropriation bill:

Provided, That hereafter no part of the appropriation for "Cooperative Range Improvements" shall be expended in any national forest until funds or other contributions at least equal to such expenditures are made available by States or other local public or private sources, except that claims recognized by the act of December 29, 1950, shall be accepted as contributions for the purposes of this section.

Mr. WHITTEN. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITTEN. In view of the fact that a point of order has been made to the last half of the paragraph I make a point of order against the entire paragraph. I do not think it can be argued that it is not subject to a point of order. A point of order having been made to

half of the paragraph, I make a point of order against the entire paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member desire to be heard on the point of order?

The Chair sustains the point of order to the entire paragraph.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: Page 26, line 12, insert:

"COOPERATIVE RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

"For artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious plants on national forests, as authrized by section 12 of the act of April 24, 1950 (Public Law 478), $700,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to argue the point of order right now. If the gentleman intends to make a point of order against the amendment I ask him to do so now.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not want to surrender any rights.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am willing to argue the point of order right now.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. The effect of the amendment is to restore half of a paragraph that was stricken out on a point of order and the restored half is in exactly the same words as those which went out on the point of order. Therefore, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. That is within the gentleman's rights. If the gentleman wishes to make the point of order and press it the Chair is ready to hear him.

Mr. WHITTEN. I make the point of order.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I call the Chair's attention to the remarks made by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] on yesterday, which appear in yesterday's RECORD which shows that this particular item I am attempting to reinsert is authorized by law.

Mr. Chairman, I refer to section 12 of Public Law 478, Eighty-first Congress, which reads as follows:

Of the moneys received from grazing fees by the Treasury from each national forest during each fiscal year there shall be available at the end thereof when appropriated by Congress an amount equivalent to 2 cents per animal-month for sheep and goats and 10 cents per animal-month for other kinds of livestock under permit on such national forest during the calendar year in which the fiscal year begins, which appropriated amount shall be available until expended on such national forests, under such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, for (1) artificial revegetation, including the collection or purchase of necessary seed: (2) construction and maintenance of drift or division fences and stock-watering places, bridges, corrals, driveways, or other necessary range improvements; (3) control of range-destroying rodents; or (4) eradication of poisonous plants and noxious weeds, in order to protect or improve the future productivity of the range.

Mr. Chairman, I maintain and respectfully call your attention to the fact that this distinctly authorizes the section of this particular paragraph which I seek by my amendment to have reinserted.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] desire to be heard?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the act under which this amendment is offered provides:

An amount equivalent to 2 cents per animal-month for sheep and goats and 10 cents per animal-month for other kinds of livestock under permit on such national forest during the calendar year 1950 but not in excess of the amount derived from grazing fees received during the fiscal year 1951 from such national forests.

That is the authority. The gentleman's amendment appropriates $700,000, if I understood it correctly, and there is no indication that is the amount of the grazing fees. The authorization says that in no instance can it exceed the amount of the grazing fees reecived. The basic law does not provide for a flat appropriation and I respectfully submit it is not authority for an appropriation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to quote a statement of Mr. Granger of the Forest Service relative to this particular item, appearing on page 490, part 1, of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, as follows:

Mr. GRANGER. This is a new program which came in last year as far as this appropriation item is concerned.

It provides for using a portion of the grazing receipts, determined on a basis of 2 cents a month for sheep, 10 cents for cattle and other livestock, for grazing on the national forest land.

On the basis of that formula for 1952 the amount that would be due under that arrangement would be $750,000. More than half of that goes into the maintenance of existing improvements. The rest of it is available for construction.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, it is irrelevant what Mr. Granger may think, what he may say or what the records may show. That is not pertinent to the point, as I see it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I add that certainly Mr. Granger of the Forest Service is referring to the act passed by the Eighty-first Congress which I quoted to the committee in full.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is in order, and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, as you have seen, the point of order made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has resulted in the removal of the entire paragraph commencing on page 26, line 12. I want to be fair with the Members from the West. If we here in the House do not make here available this $700,000, I think we are doing them an injustice. Yesterday I called attention to certain things that did not seem to me to be right. In the first instance we have the Taylor grazing areas charging through the Department of the Interior on 10 cents a month for grazing a cow with calf at side upon those areas. On the other hand, the Forest Service charges up to 50 cents a month for the same pasturage. It does seem to me that even that amount is a very small fee. But, regardless of my feelings on that subject, I think it is only fair and just to the Members from the West to permit them to have this $700,000 which the committee intended them to have for the improvement of the grass potentialities of the forest ranges. This will go into the bill in the other body. So, from a practical viewpoint, why not put it in now? I might say that if the members of this committee will study carefully the remarks of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART], as given yesterday on page 5217 of yesterday's RECORD relative to this matter, I think that you will agree that it is only fair to allow the Western States to have this money without putting on such rigid restrictions as would make it impossible for those States to take advantage of that appropriation.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. The point the gentleman is making is this, is it not, that this money is paid by the livestock people themselves and is in a trust fund for the purposes of range improvement? Is that not correct?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. You might put it that way. It is in a sense a trust fund paid in by the cattlemen of the West.

Mr. ENGLE. Well, as I understood Mr. Granger's testimony he testified that it would run something like $750,000 for this coming year.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct.

Mr. ENGLE. In other words, that is money that the livestock people themselves are paying in any way; it is going into the Treasury, and this simply authorizes the use of it for the purposes for which it is collected; is that not correct?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct. Of course, I will not agree with the gentleman that the livestock people are paying in enough for the grazing privileges to the Treasury, but the gentleman is in the main correct and I think it is only fair to make this money available without strings attached which would make impossible the use of the money.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will see fit to agree to this amendment.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think it should be understood by the members of the Committee that a few years ago this money was collected by the Forest Service and held in a separate fund and not paid into the Treasury. I believe it was this Committee that objected to that method

of handling this fund for range improvement. Therefore legislation was enacted whereby those funds are now paid into the Treasury for the improvement of the range. Therefore you are, under this appropriation, simply returning funds that have been collected for a specific purpose by agreement with the stockmen. Formerly they were not paid into the Treasury; now they are paid into the Treasury and should be made available for the purpose for which they are earmarked. If this amendment prevails, that money which was paid into the Treasury for this particular purpose, that is, cooperative range improvement, will be made available.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I am in agreement with the principle that is involved in the latter part of the amendment that was stricken on a point of order. By that I mean the principle of cooperation between the State-owned lands that may be grazing lands and federally owned lands that may be grazing lands, and even private lands that may be grazing lands. I feel that the greatest benefit that could come to our watersheds—and I will ask the gentleman a question based upon this—would be the greatest amount of cooperation between the Federal, State, private, and county ownership, if the latter exists. Is not that the attempt the gentleman from Montana has in mind?

Mr. D'EWART. That is true. I think you do have at the present time a large amount of cooperation. I think you should encourage it in the future.

Mr. HORAN. I do not want this amendment, if it prevails, to allow the Forest Service or anyone else who purports to be in favor of range improvement to think he has any green light in any given direction other than working together with everybody who wants to improve the watersheds.

Mr. D'EWART. That is absolutely true. We also have a cooperative fund for fire protection to which the user contributed.

On page 491 of the hearings, Mr. Granger, Assistant Chief of the Forest Service, had this to say:

> We had a device by which we were using deposits made by the grazing permittees for this same purpose, which we had reason to believe was a legitimate method of obtaining funds.
>
> It was subsequently held to be in effect use of receipts. So that was discontinued. This was enacted to take place of that. We had substantially the same amount of money available for several years past under that other arrangement.

In other words, at one time this money was held out there on the forest for use for these range improvements. Because either this subcommittee or some other committee objected to that method, it is now paid into the Treasury. I think it would not be dealing in good faith if we did not recognize that situation and make the money available for the purpose for which it is intended.

Mr. Chairman, I discussed this matter at length during general debate yesterday and my remarks will be found on pages 5217 and 5218 of the May 9 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

(Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 12 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, possibly no appropriation bill this year has been given more careful scrutiny by the subcommittee of the appropriations committee than this bill and great cuts have been made again this year as last year. The House acting as a Committee of the Whole has been able to make some additional cuts all of which is well and good. No group in our land is more anxious to see the Government budget brought down to reasonable proportions than the farmers of our land, and they are ready to stand their share of the cuts in this particular bill which deals with the department of agriculture.

The farmers are disturbed, however, by demands upon them that they increase the production of meat and grain and at the same time submit to unwieldy price control, controls invoked with due regards to the difficulties of the farmer. Unnecessary controls lead to black markets and black markets hurt every one.

People are crying for lower prices but do they realize that the farmers receive only a small part of the price paid for food and clothing in the retail markets of the city. I have some interesting figures from a recent copy of a farm publication. Let me give you a few:

If the farmer gave away the wheat that goes into the 16-cent loaf of bread, the loaf would still cost 13.4 cents.

If the farmer gave away the wool for a $50 suit of clothes, the suit would still cost $40.50.

If the dairyman furnished the milk for a 22- or 23-cent quart of milk free, still the milk would cost the consumer 11½ cents.

If the farmer gave the beans for a 16-cent can of pork and beans, it would still be 14 cents at the grocery store.

And a package of cigarettes that sells for 20 cents would cost 17 cents if the tobacco farmer gave the tobacco absolutely without cost.

No group has been as reasonable as the farmers during the war years. They have produced without any guaranties. They have produced when their sons were serving valiantly in the armed services and the farmer has been compelled to gamble on weather, market and Government controls. The farmer has an 8-hour day all right but it is 8 hours before dinner and 8 hours after dinner.

During the war years, Iowa farmers produced 10 percent of the basic food of this country and they did it gladly and without any boasting or fanfare and with about 10 percent of the boys and girls in the armed services. Let no one ever worry about the profit that farmers make. Over a period of years, farmers never make too much profit. It may be doubted if any man ever became rich farming. Some have done well on the increase in the value of land. Farming operations with due consideration for investment, hazards of crop conditions, skill required and the long hours and hard work, never show a very big return. Farmers can be counted on to do their share at all times.

(Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permisson to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I think we reached the point of taking half a loaf or no loaf at all. I think it would be a serious mistake to knock out this entire provision, and I therefore support the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]. Admittedly and clearly it would be preferable to have a cooperative arrangement whereby the various States contribute as much to this meritorious program as the Federal Government proposes to contribute, but if that is not possible to achieve at this time I do not think we should eliminate the program in its entirety. The program can be a very valuable one. Clearly, there is a need for improvement of the very lands from which we now are receiving revenue and of other lands which can benefit from the program. As these lands are improved it stands to reason that they will produce greater returns.

To me, this is an investment, and I think it is a very sound investment.

At some stage later on in the consideration of this matter we should be able to arrive at a satisfactory basis for a cooperative agreement in which the States will put up their respective part of the funds.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think the gentleman has stated the case 100 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

(Mr. GRANGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation is the result of legislation which we passed last year with the thought in mind of doing everything that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and that the gentleman from Mississippi wants to do, and that is to have cooperation between the users of the forests and the Government. You must remember the difference between the cooperation between private property and Federal property. They are two different things because anyone, the grazer or anyone who gets timber from the forest lands has no

right, is there by sufferance of the Government. It would be impossible to go around and have people make contributions because they might not be there tomorrow. So this device was thought out and after a year or two of study we decided this was the best way to get the cooperation which is necessary and to get the users of the forest service to pay the additional cost for range improvements. It seems to me that is entirely sound, and as it has been said heretofore this money has already been contributed with the understanding that it would be used for range purposes and the purpose for which it was designed under the legislation authorizing this appropriation.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES. I appreciate the statement that the gentleman is making. I would also like to emphasize the point that under this permit system which is demanded of the livestock raisers this program is working in cooperation with those people on the improvements of the forest lands for the purpose of livestock raising, and those are the lands that those people have to go to.

Mr. GRANGER. That is right. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, you folks who want to practice a little economy. I think we all want to practice economy. I do not want to seem facetious about it, but the title of this is "Cooperative Range Improvements." The United States owns these lands, and a man for a fee grazes his cattle on those lands. The argument is advanced that the one who owns the land is under an obligation to plant forage or hay for the cattle that are on it. This is not a cooperative basis, it is all Federal Government expenditure. Oh, it says the amount of money shall be equivalent to 10 cents a month for one animal and 2 cents for another, but it does not say anything about the rates being increased to offset the Federal Government's expenditures.

Let us be practical about this matter. If you want to save some money, this amendment should be defeated. It provides that instead of the money that the Federal Government gets for grazing these peoples' cattle going into the Treasury, it shall go to the planting of feed out there for the cattle that are on it. Yes, they call it cooperation, because that helps to get it through, but if you want cooperation, require some local contribution and you will get it. If you want to hold down expenses in the Department of Agriculture, cut this out, so we will have some basis on which to develop a cooperative basis. This is serious business. We have worked hard on this bill. I do not resent anybody trying to cut it, but if you are trying to cut it, do not turn yourselves around and start adding to it and then claim that you are making any record of consistency.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. D'EWART. The hearings indicate that this money will not be used for reseeding. You are appropriating other funds in another part of the bill for reseeding.

Mr. WHITTEN. Do you know why this bill was passed last year? It was indicated a while ago that our committee raised objection. I asked the Forest Service for 2 or 3 years whether they should not try to make such an arrangement. Last year the Comptroller General, at the instance of one of our colleagues, investigated it, and they have been doing it for 40 years and they would not tell us about it. They said, "That was under a device we used." I asked them, "Why do you use the 'de'." They did it in violation of the law and they did it to get this bill through.

Now, do you want to help this committee hold down expenditures? If you do, you will defeat this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 38, noes 55.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, in conformance with an agreement reached among the leadership, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I have observed in the RECORD on the Gossett amendment to the independent offices appropriation bill, I was paired in favor of amendment through no fault of the pair clerk. This was erroneous and, of course, since it was a live pair, it cannot be corrected but should be briefly explained.

There should be no valid objection to some temporary decrease in the public-building program due to war necessities, but on the other hand, reduction of the committee's program of 50,000 houses to a mere token of 5,000 houses was in my judgment too drastic, and I could not have supported an amendment of this character.

I think it is generally recognized that I have continually, and I hope effectively, supported the public housing program, and I do not like to see it even temporarily curtailed to the extent suggested by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 72. A joint resolution to provide certain benefits for certain persons who shall have served in the Armed Forces of the United States on and after June 27, 1950.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF MAY 14

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of my good friend from Massachusetts if he can tell us what the program will be for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Monday is District Day, and there are two bills ready, I understand, H. R. 3297, dealing with the District of Columbia Department of Civil Defense. I have a note here which reads "Accept Senate amendments."

H. R. 3957, dealing with District of Columbia building associations.

Tuesday: The Private Calendar, followed by a continuation of consideration of the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. If disposed of in time it will be followed by the India emergency food relief bill.

Wednesday: Memorial services for our departed colleagues, with no legislative business for the day.

Thursday, Friday, and Saturday: Continuation of consideration of the India emergency food relief bill.

Any further program will be announced later.

Conference reports, of course, may be brought up at any time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I wish to ask the majority leader when we may expect the State Department appropriation bill to be called up. We are all anxious about it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to advise the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman know of anyone who could advise me?

Mr. McCORMACK. I assume that if the gentleman would consult the chairman of the committee he could get the information from him.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I cannot get any information about it.

Mr. LANGER. I will say that quite an effort was made by some of us on the Republican side, in which we were joined by some Members on the Democratic side to stop it. The point I make is that neither the Republican nor the Democratic policy committees have adopted that as a matter of policy, have ever made it a part of their program during all the time these goods have been shipped to foreign countries.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor.

Letter of Col. S. L. A. Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Col. S. L. A. Marshall, military analyst for the Detroit News. Colonel Marshall was formerly chief historian in the European theater during World War II, and more recently was attached to a special Army mission in Korea, from whence he has recently returned.

Colonel Marshall's letter to me is self-explanatory, and is intended to clarify the record as regards the attack upon the Army by the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL] as having a prussianized general staff. In the interest of fairness I believe the RECORD should contain the viewpoint expressed by Colonel Marshall as directed to me in his letter of April 12, 1951.

APRIL 12, 1951.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: During a House discussion of aspects of our defense policy on April 3, 1951, Congressman WERDEL of California, attacked the Army for having a Prussianized general staff. He then extended his remarks in the RECORD, introducing certain exhibits not alluded to in his speech.

I have that report. I am taking the trouble to make a part way reply to it because, while I doubt that any Member of the House would out of sinister motive attempt to undermine confidence in any part of the Armed Forces, it is altogether possible that the effect might be produced through unsullied ignorance.

It is not my business to defend the Army or its General Staff system. However, in the course of his remarks Mr. WERDEL quoted "an Army officer, Col. S. L. A. Marshall" and turned my words against the Army and the General Staff, by using them out of their historical and written context. I, therefore, feel it a duty to say what I know.

That I am not an Army officer but a reservist is well known to you and could have been ascertained by anyone taking the trouble to examine the Army Register, or for that matter, Who's Who. That simple fact has some relation to the truth or falsity of Mr. WERDEL's general charge against the Army. It is hardly a mark of Prussianism in a General Staff that it will call a civilian colonel to temporary active duty for the express purpose of reviewing Army processes from the inside, saying where they might be modified or corrected toward more perfectly serving national policy and the common interest, and making specific recommendations toward these ends. To my mind, this self-critical attitude within the Army and its acute sensitiveness to the public weal in part answer whether Mr. WERDEL knows whereof he speaks.

The paper from which Mr. WERDEL quoted was classified "Confidential." I don't know how he got it. But being so classified, it cannot be quoted by me, though Mr. WERDEL put parts of it directly into the RECORD. The question of the ethics of his procedure aside, I would again ask about the validity of his judgment. He said with respect to it that the paper "was so startling to them (The General Staff) that they promptly had the report marked 'Confidential' and ordered it locked up." Nothing of the kind happened. I personally had the paper so stamped. Mr. WERDEL knows the nature of the paper; he himself says that he cannot quote it in full because its contents have international implications. Therefore classifying it "Confidential" was routine; I so classified it before others read it. Far from conspiring to suppress the paper, the General Staff gave it more than normal circulation, considering the classification. A second edition was published by the General Staff so that there would be more jogging of thought all down the line. Else, Mr. WERDEL would never have procured a copy. He says the handling of this paper is proof of the Staff's Prussianism; I submit that to any reasonable mind, it is proof of the exact opposite.

But further, Mr. WERDEL says that the paper is a criticism of "present Army doctrine," adding that it challenges the doctrine "as being defeatist in character." To use the most polite phrase which occurs, he is guilty of a terminological inexactitude. The paper was written in April 1948; nothing said by way of criticism within that paper applies to Army doctrine today. Moreover, had the whole paper been quoted by Mr. WERDEL, it would have been recognized not as an indictment of the Army but as an analysis of the extraordinary difficulty in which the whole Defense Establishment was then placed because of indecision elsewhere in the Nation. We then had the Marshall plan and the Truman doctrine. But we had made no move to league with Western Europe for mutual defense or to arm our friends or even to get our own military house in order. Rejecting isolationism, we had not yet accepted its only possible strategic alternative—collective security with strength suited to the need. True, I discussed the confusions in our military policy, but only as a reflection of the doubts and contradictions elsewhere in the national landscape which thwarted military planning on any grander scale than we had known in the past. It was argued that if military men could begin to ponder the national problem from its center to the circumference, informing themselves more fully on foreign policy, the better to fashion a military policy in harmony with it, they might assist the Nation to a sound course. The Army had about two divisions in being in this country at that writing. If Mr. WERDEL does not think there was good cause for it to be concerned about its position, his reasoning is not like mine. Again, if he believes that a plea for open-mindedness and sober thought is the mark of Prussianism within an army, his reasoning is not like mine; nor is his knowledge of the German general staff.

In what the press quoted of what Mr. WERDEL said about the Army, the emphasis was placed upon his statement relating to the circulating of a paper written by Gen. Heinz Guderian, of the German Army. This is a paper called Unification or Coordination. Mr. WERDEL says that the prime motive behind the publication of this paper is to indoctrinate officers toward the day when the military can take over the control of this Republic; it is difficult to understand how any man can strain his imagination that far. The paper is a simple treatise on military organizational problems as experienced in Germany. It would read as that to anyone save perhaps the character Humpty-Dumpty, who used the word "glory" to mean a "nice, knock-down argument," saying, "When I use a word it means just what I choose it to mean." In seeking to prove perfidy where none exists, Mr. WERDEL says, "I am advised these studies by the German generals are basic references by those in the Pentagon who believe that the only thing wrong with the supreme Prussian staff was the people who ran it." It happens that, as chief historian of the European theater, I initiated the series of studies among the German generals, though I had nothing to do with the Guderian studies. The policy was promoted simply for the knowledge that it would produce. That is the main way for soldiers to further their education. For the same reasons, whatever we can learn about Russian methods in warfare, Japanese principles of command, or Chinese military indoctrination is to the advantage of the Army. To Mr. WERDEL it might seem better that we keep soldiers as ignorant as Parsifal. I would prefer to believe that the words of Mirabeau Lamar, "Cultivated mind is the guardian genius of democracy," apply to men in military suits, as well as to Congressmen.

No general staff is ever perfect; nor is any other group of individuals. In the Army, now and then, you will meet a potential man on horseback. Occasionally one may get onto the General Staff. But men of the same sort—driven by vainglory and inordinate appetite for power—also get to Congress occasionally. I know of no way under the sun that our society, or any important part thereof, can be purged of such people. The main question is whether thought and motivation are reasonably sound among the majority of those in control. Having had a long and intimate experience with our Army General Staff, I simply wish to add my witness that they are as deeply devoted to their country and as fully committed to the preservation of our fundamental liberties as any body of men in my experience.

Faithfully yours,

S. L. A. MARSHALL.

Beans and Meat Costs

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

(Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, there are two points I want to discuss very briefly. One has to do with the operation of the general program of the Production and Marketing Administration and the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the other is the subject of meat supply on which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] just spoke.

As we all know, the Commodity Credit Corporation goes out and purchases great quantities of commodities. Some commodities are at times stored over a long period of time. They are subject to great deterioration. The time comes when the Commodity Credit Corporation must either sell or lose goods. If the Commodity Credit Corporation sells those goods without a loss, it must sell them at the time the market will absorb them, otherwise they must cut the price, which starts great trouble in the markets through the Commodity Credit Corporation's inventories competing with the curernt inventories of farmers and dealers who have goods to sell of like kind.

I am going to use a specific case. The Commodity Credit Corporation buys great quantities of dry beans. They are stored in California, New Mexico, Colorado, Nebraska, Michigan, New York State, and other places. The most difficult storage conditions are in New York State, Nebraska, and Michigan, where the weather conditions are against the storing of such commodities.

The 1948 crop was substantially purchased; the 1949 crop was substantially purchased, and the 1950 crop is here to deal with. In some areas like Michigan the 1950 crops had terrific weather conditions to deal with, and many of the beans are of a very, very poor quality. At the time the grower of the beans, the dirt farmer, the man who performs the stoop labor—s-t-o-o-p labor, and I spell that out because one of the newspapers picked that up as "astute labor"—the man who performs the stoop labor did not get 10 cents per hour wage on his bean crop of last year because lots of those beans have been sold for as low as 2½ cents per pound against a Commodity Credit Corporation support price of 7 or more cents per pound for good beans. But many of the beans were of such poor quality they did not qualify for Commodity Credit Corporation loans.

I understand there are something like 1,100,000 bags of 100 pounds each of poor quality beans still on hand. They are in competition more or less with the Commodity Credit Corporation, which is selling 1948 and 1949 so-called high quality beans.

Here is a case where a great group of farmers cannot qualify with a commodity which they have because of the low quality of the beans. They have no market because the market is absorbed presently by the Commodity Credit Corporation in selling its better quality 1948 and 1949 beans. I spent 3 hours of discussion with the spokesman for the farmers and others yesterday and today, the last conference ending just a few minutes ago. The farmers face the situation where from 500,000 to a million bags of beans are going to be thrown away at a time when the Commodity Credit Corporation has removed all acreage quotas and is asking that more beans be produced. I submitted to Mr. Kruse and other men, and Mr. Hill, of the PMA, these questions today:

I said, "Are these Government agencies, the State Department, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the PMA, the Treasury Department, the department of the White House, and the department of the Congress, going to sit here and let a million bags of beans be thrown into the ditch?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I did not hear the gentleman's statement clearly. Who is it that is throwing away the beans?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The farmers who have these low-quality beans, which beans cannot qualify for Commodity Credit loans, since we are now moving into the hot weather, due to the poor quality of the beans and their spoilage, they must be destroyed. The point I was trying to make is that the PMA and the Commodity Credit Corporation and the State Department ought to go along with a situation or plan whereby these beans are processed and put in a can and thus be preserved for food. There is such a thing as canning something before it goes completely haywire, and thus save it for human consumption.

Mr. COOLEY. You mean the beans are not of the quality which would qualify them for a loan and therefore there is no way to give the farmers any protection?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is right. There is no way that the farmers can collect a penny on them, and there is no way that those beans can be preserved for human consumption unless they are processed before the hot weather spoils them.

May I say to the distinguished chairman of our Committee on Agriculture that we have worked on this proposition since last November and today I asked Mr. Hill and Mr. Kruse, "Will you just answer one simple question? Will you say to me whether or not anything is to be done?" I said, "I am going to see my people in my district on Friday of this week, and I want to take them a message." Mr. Kruse replied, in effect, "You can tell them that as of 11 o'clock this morning nothing effective has been done and we see nothing in sight to be done."

Mr. COOLEY. Did the gentleman suggest to them anything which might be done?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes, sir; I did.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to know just what it is that the gentleman thinks should be done.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I suggested two things to them. I said, "If you do not have the authority at the present time in any of these Government agencies to pick up these beans and process them, and thus preserve them, why do you not tell the respective committees of the Congress which have the authority to do this, so that we can take the necessary steps to save these beans for human consumption at this time?" I said, "I do not want to be a party to a proposition where a million bags of good food will be destroyed because the Government agencies do not take care of them. I do not want to be a party to that. I do not think you should want to be a party to it." I said, "If you do not have the authority at the present time, tell us so that we can give you the authority, provided that is the will of the Congress, to give you the authority." I said, "Whatever is done has to be done within the next 30 days, because I know something about these beans, and I know what is going to happen to them through spoilage."

I said, "Whether it is 100,000 bags or a million bags, and the figures indicate it may be a large part of 1,150,000 bags, and that is the best figure I can get from the local chairmen of the county PMA committees and elevator and bean people; those beans should be saved."

That was one suggestion. Another suggestion I made was this, which I am not too enthusiastic about, because of the time element. I said, "The State Department went before the committee and recommended, in connection with the deal with India, which involves wheat, that there be 20,000 tons of beans put into the package." They advocated that wheat and beans and sorghum grains might be put into the package. I said, "You may claim that the 20,000 tons of beans the State Department is talking about is another 20,000 tons of those good beans held by CCC of the 1948–49 crop." I said if CCC takes up the 20,000-ton slack that does not do these farmers with low-quality beans any good. The low-quality beans should have been processed, the good ones canned, and bad ones eliminated.

The last recommendation with respect to amending the India wheat bill, the time limit is involved, and you may not be able to implement it fast enough to prevent those beans from spoiling due to hot weather.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. In other words, the beans will have to be processed at an early date.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. Or they will not be good for human consumption?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is right. These facts were all made known to all of these agencies as early as last November, and I have been working on it ever since.

Mr. COOLEY. If they are not fit for human consumption, would they be good for cattle feed?

Mr. CRAWFORD. You could feed a few of them to cattle or hogs but for instance I have the figures here. They show 1,150,000 bags. I said, "Let us suppose you used 650,000 bags to feed livestock, you will still have a half million bags left. What are you going to do with those?"

Mr. Kruse says "We haven't anything in mind." I am not criticizing him. I am just stating the facts.

Mr. COOLEY. I just wondered if the gentleman pointed out any program under which they would be authorized to take over the beans or incur losses.

Mr. CRAWFORD. At the present time the only authority that I know that they possibly have is to use them in connection with the so-called give-away food-export program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Was the gentleman encouraged to believe that they would make an effort to try to find some human use for these beans?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I was not encouraged and that is the reason I asked them the question. I said, "What can I tell my people next Friday morning?" Mr. Kruse said in effect "You will have to tell them that as of 11 o'clock this morning nothing is in sight to be done." I do not think there is anything that they plan to do. I do not think they have any concerted thought in mind to do anything about it. It is simply a part of this general Commodity Credit Corporation and PMA over-all program.

Now may I use the last minute or so to clear this matter up. That is on the subject that our chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], was speaking about. I attended that livestock meeting and I sat there and listened carefully, because I have been attending similar meetings in this city for 35 years this coming July. I have seen them come and go. I know something about agriculture. When the question was submitted, "What does it cost to produce a beef animal," you might as well say, "What does it cost to produce a pound of pecans; what does it cost to produce a bale of cotton; what does it cost to produce a pound of peanuts?"

That question is not answerable because of this: You have got millions of producers, millions of individual institutions in the form of these farms. It is not an organized industry as far as production is concerned. I raised the question. I said, "As a feeder, you know your costs." Of course as a feeder he knows his costs. As a packer he knows his costs, but when you drop from the packer to the farmer, that is where you stop on known costs, unless you meet some particular individual grower who carries an elaborate cost system on his farm. And this you do not find on small farms. You cannot give an answer as to the exact cost of producing a beef animal any more than you can answer what is the exact cost of producing a bale of cotton. I spent many years in intricate cost accounting and I know something about cost accounting. I was sorry I could not get up on that panel and talk for those fellows and answer some of those questions. We might as well be fair about all this. I do not blame the newspaper men for asking the questions for their constituents, but they are not fair questions. They were not fair questions, considering the situation that existed. Of course they did not get a clear answer to the questions.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman know that the Bureau of Agricultural Economics is in a position right now to tell you what it costs to produce a pound of cotton or a ton of peanuts or a ton of burley tobacco?

Mr. CRAWFORD. What does it cost you to produce?

Mr. COOLEY. If I were engaged in the beef-cattle business I might know; but what I would point out to you is that if these cattlemen cannot point out what it costs to produce a pound of beef, then how on earth can they contradict Mr. DiSalle because DiSalle says he can tell what it costs?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me ask the gentleman a question: Do you operate a farm?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. I operate a farm.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What do you produce on your farm?

Mr. COOLEY. But I am not a cost accountant.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Wait a minute; what do you produce?

Mr. COOLEY. That has not anything to do with it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It has a great deal to do with it. If the gentleman raises cotton I doubt if he knows what it costs him to raise a pound of cotton; or a pound of tobacco, or of peanuts.

Mr. COOLEY. I am not on a panel either to have to answer questions. As a matter of fact I raise cotton, peanuts, cows, calves, and other things.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I decline to yield any further. If there is any farmer on this floor who knows his costs, hold up your hand. No hands are held up.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Certainly.

Mr. COOLEY. Is there any man in the House who is not able to ask for BAE figures?

Mr. CRAWFORD. BAE figures are arbitrary.

Mr. COOLEY. Why not abolish BAE?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Abolish BAE? BAE does not know anything about my costs. BAE does not know what it costs my brother to run his dairy farm; they know nothing about what it costs my sister who runs a big ranch; they know nothing about my personal farm costs out here on a farm 20 minutes away from this building. They have a set of figures which they publish as an average. These figures of BAE are useful as a guide. Suppose you are manufacturing automobiles; you know your costs, otherwise you do not stay in business. Suppose you are manufacturing clothing; you know your costs. But you, a farmer, running your farm as farms are run in this country, unless you happen to have someone on your farm who is trained in cost accounting, you do not know your costs of producing anything on that farm, and any cost record of that farm if it is doing diversified farming is based on arbitrary allocation of costs. I will leave that up to any professional cost accountant in this country; it is an arbitrary cost; it is not an exact cost. Those questions down there the other night could not be answered directly. If you want to rely on arbitrary and general average costs of producing meat, then take the BAE cost figures and don't ask the individual farmer for his cost figures. Finally, let me say this, I am not going to vote for the extension of the price control act. It is political skulduggery and a fallacy which some want to impose on our people. The proposed way of meeting prices on meat and other commodities is a political sham and a joke pulled on the American people to make them believe that the politicians will protect their prices and their costs. It is a shame and disgrace that this Congress should do such a thing; and, of course, the meat program will reduce your supply of meat.

There are two things that have not been discussed at all in this whole thing: The Government agencies will induce the calling of speculative loans in this country. Beef moves on credit. The Federal Reserve Board under the instructions of the President has passed the word to the Clearing House Association; they in turn have passed the word to their individual bank members to call and discontinue speculative loans. The pressure is on to cut the prices through the contraction of credit; and, of course, the man carrying an inventory of beef, whether farmer, feeder, or packer, or some man in between is going to close out his inventories, and you will have short meat supplies.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. He made a statement about feeders and said they could make accurate calculations with regard to costs.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; do you know why?

Mr. COOLEY. How about the breeders and the original producers, say, down there. They would not be forced to operate without a profit under this order. It is the feeder that is being squeezed to death, if I understand the situation. Now, if the feeders were subjected to collateral questions or unfair questions by the press the other night I was not conscious of it. I thought they were propounding very accurate and correct questions.

But I want to say that the reason I made the remarks here was that I felt that the feeders, even those were woefully weak in resisting the order. But we want to furnish them an opportunity and a forum in the House committee where they can come in and be asked fair questions and be allowed to give fair answers, and upon all that information then we can make up our minds.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is a means of fair discussion; and I hope that occurs, but it is not fair, for instance, where the question was asked the other night, "How are we going to get meat at a reasonable price?" What does the word "reasonable" mean as it rolls around in the mind of the person asking it? That question, under the conditions governing, was unfair, I do not care who the man was that asked it.

The Late Honorable John Kee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THURMOND CHATHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1951

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my sincere regret on the passing of our beloved chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Judge JOHN KEE. He was a fine gentleman, a fine American, and a fine friend. His loss will be felt throughout the world. A friend of Democracy has passed on.

The MacArthur Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Tuscaloosa, (Ala.) News carried in its issue of Saturday, May 5, 1951, a letter written by Dr. Clanton W. Williams, professor of history at the University of Alabama to his brother-in-law, Lt. Richard McDonald Payne, serving with the American forces in Korea. The letter is an exceptionally able, enlightening, and challenging statement on the world situation and the danger which faces our country. The Tuscaloosa News captions it "The MacArthur case in light of Marshall's grand strategy."

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD. I strongly commend it to Senators, irrespective of what their views may be.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the letter will make approximately three pages of the RECORD at a cost of $246.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MACARTHUR CASE IN LIGHT OF MARSHALL'S GRAND STRATEGY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Within recent weeks Dr. Clanton W. Williams, professor of history at the University of Alabama, has addressed several groups in Tuscaloosa and elsewhere, treating the general world war picture brought most directly into focus by the MacArthur dismissal. There has been much demand for the text of this address, by school officials, civic club members, and others. The Tuscaloosa News asked Dr. Williams to prepare a text, and he has done so, in the form of a letter to his 25-year-old brother-in-law, a lieutenant in Korea. As a public service, the News is printing this entire text herewith.)

UNIVERSITY, ALA.,
April 29, 1951.

Lt. RICHARD MCDONALD PAYNE,
Company E, Ninth RCT, APO 248,
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR MAC: You asked in your last letter what people back here were thinking about Harry Truman's removal of General MacArthur. You said that it came as quite a surprise to you men in Korea. I think it came as a real shock to most of the people throughout the United States of America. Surely the deluge of anti-Truman-pro-MacArthur letters which flooded Washington during the first 2 weeks indicates that the people of the Nation as a whole were deeply disturbed and seemed to be convinced that a great man was being eliminated from a confused scene by a man of relatively small stature.

Deep resentment across the Nation greeted the news. One small indication of that was a poll of my first class (second half of English history) for a show of hands as to whether or not Truman had done right. Only 1 student said "yes"; 6 would not commit themselves; 36 were vehemently pro-MacArthur.

GENERAL RECEIVES WILD WELCOME

We listened to the radio broadcasts of the wild welcomes given the general in Hawaii and San Francisco. I was at Maxwell Field taking a physical examination (which I passed for recall June 1) when the general was making his speech to Congress, but I heard rebroadcasts far into the night. Then the general went on to New York, where 7,500,000 screaming humans cheered him to the skies. Chicago went wild; and last Friday Milwaukee followed suit.

It was extremely interesting to read the various comments about the whole affair, and also to note the inconsistency of the pro-isolationists in Congress whereby they had suddenly thrown all isolation to the winds in the emotional confusion of the hour. Republican DEWEY SHORT, after MacArthur's speech to Congress said, "We have just heard the voice of God." Former President Hoover, who has been advocating desertion of all our allies except Japan and "perhaps" Britain (but not appeasement) said that MacArthur was St. Paul reincarnate. Of course Senator MCCARTHY was given fresh ammunition for labeling as pro-Communists Dean Acheson and others who said MacArthur should have been removed. Senator DIRKSEN admitted in a TV interview that the Republicans were going to use this affair to the fullest. You can imagine how Fulton Lewis, Jr., and other Chicago Tribune people have been going to town. I don't know what a Gallup Poll would show right now, but it is reasonable to assume that Truman's stock is at its lowest. In fact, I doubt that any President since Andrew Jackson, has enjoyed such universal unpopularity as Truman did last week. You may have heard how he was "boo'd" at Griffith Field.

Regardless of what one may think of Truman and Acheson, surely any objective approach toward trying to evaluate the mess we are in must not stem from personal likes or dislikes or emotion. It must stem from several facts: Fact No. 1: the Communist crusade was going to proceed regardless of who were President and Secretary of State of the United States of America. Fact No. 2: At least 90 percent of the people of this country approved of our action on June 25, 1950, when the Russians sent the Korean Reds across the thirty-eighth parallel. Fact No. 3: Now that the Chinese Reds have made a new war out of the Korean affair, and we can't see where we are going, the Nation has become highly exasperated.

Fact No. 4: The natural reaction was to look for scapegoats. (Here the "outs" struck oil.) Fact No. 5: MacArthur, as any field commander with an immediate military problem before him would do, screams loud and long about the restrictions placed upon him. Fact No. 6: People like me who have loved ones like you caught on a firing line with no immediate goal in view, had a natural impulse to yell to Truman, "Give MacArthur everything he wants." Instead, (Fact No. 7) Truman tells MacArthur to "shut up"; MacArthur refuses and, trying to go over the heads of his military superiors, appeals to the people through the anti-Truman forces in Congress (whether they be isolationists, McCarthyites (Anglophobes, reactionary southern Democrats, or just office-hungry Republicans). Fact No. 8: Harry, whom no one may accuse of lacking guts, fires the General and gives him an opportunity to step forth into the blazing spotlight with all stops pulled. The General takes his cue and little Harry's stock sinks.

And now you face a renewed Communist drive.

OTHER DRAMAS ARE UNFOLDING

All the while there are other dramas being unfolded elsewhere. The MacArthur show is drama No. 1. Yours is drama No. 2. The others are:

Drama No. 3: In Paris Gromyko is stalling around at a conference which is a preliminary conference to a big conference to bring together the Big Four Foreign Ministers. They are supposed eventually to work out a peace treaty for Germany and otherwise settle issues in Europe. We are supposed to enter into a contract with the Russians—a contract which we westerners are expected by Moscow to accept in good faith (like Yalta and Potsdam), when we know that the Russians have no tradition for honoring contractual arrangements, indeed have damned contracts as a bourgeois institution. Still Gromyko has found that our Philip Jessup and the British and French deputies this time are not going to be bullied. They know full well what the Russian game is and they are not going to let the Communists take over the German military and technological potential through diplomatic default. And Gromyko isn't even making much propaganda capital out of his one. Our patient presence there is denying him this.

Drama No. 4: Also in Paris and across Western Europe, General Eisenhower is working feverishly to build a military machine capable of stopping the Russian hordes from taking Western Europe. Whether or not he will succeed is at this moment hanging in the balance. Several things are decidedly in his favor—giving him precious time. One is what you are doing in Asia (see below); another is the Russian knowledge of our growing stockpile of atom bombs and United States strategic air power. Still a third is the Russian hope that the Kremlin may yet take Western Europe by diplomacy and trickery.

Drama No. 5: Meantime, the Communists are busy elsewhere—still trying to sabotage the rearmament of Western Europe—still rattling the sword at Yugoslavia and the Mediterranean—working in Iran to deny the British their middle-eastern oil—working in Africa toward denying us the uranium deposits of the Congo—and continuing to build up their own military machine and those of the satellite countries, including the East German police.

Drama No. 6 lies in what we are doing at home. Despite all the bickering and emotional confusion of the moment, plus the usual amount of cheating and jockeying of certain tunnel-visioned Americans, this Nation is getting stronger by the hour. Given time, we shall have built enough matériel for ourselves, for Europe, and for Asiatics, and all other potential allies. Time is the great factor—time which you and your fellows are helping to provide—time to mobilize our manpower and that of Europe—time to give our scientists those last precious moments before the word is given: "Freeze models. Standardize. Proceed with mass production."

Drama No. 7 is offstage. It is being enacted in the field of atomic fission—the increasing plant capacity—the coming Eniwetok experiments with new A or maybe H bombs—and the continuing feverish research in university and Government labs.

You have to see all of these dramas at once to be able to appreciate fully the one in which you are a participant. And you must see them all against the backdrop of our day in history.

RECALLING A PROPHECY OF 1939

Mind if your old professor repeats some of what you learned in current world history? Do you remember the broadcast I made in December 1939 in which attention was called to the fact that there were three great ideologies abroad in the world: Democracy, communism, and fascism—each a deadly enemy of the other two? I had stuck my neck out then and had ventured to predict that:

"Before this Second World War is over fascism, unable to triumph over democracy, will turn on communism. Consequently, democracy and communism will be erstwhile allies, and shall destroy the power of fascism. Then arising out of the gore will be the remaining two ideologies staring at each other with eyes of suspicion and hatred. * * * Before this century has run its course, one or the other, the Communist International or international democracy, shall triumph.

needs through the application of a controlled materials plan, will improve the situation later." (J. E. Goble, president of the National Tube Co., told the meeting yesterday that steel allocations for natural gas transmission lines this year and in 1952 would exceed last year's 2,425,000 tons.)

Brown declared that the availability of materials to produce, process, transport and distribute gas and oil is "small indeed" in relation to the need—"in spite of a most vigorous attempt on the part of experienced gas and oil men in PAD to convince the Governmental authorities holding the materials purse strings of the reality of the demand."

Commodity Credit Corporation Administration Expense Limitations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, since the section of the agriculture appropriation bill containing the Commodity Credit Corporation administrative expense limitation has not been reached, I want to submit for the consideration of my colleagues certain basic and fundamental facts with reference to this item.

In the RECORD of May 9, at pages 5224 and 5225, I submitted data I had been able to assemble at that time from the committee hearings and report and from the monthly reports of the Commodity Credit Corporation, particularly that for the month ending March 31, 1951, which was made public on Monday.

I am completely convinced that the amount recommended by the committee, $15,000,000, can and should be reduced substantially without any actual possibility of injury to the necessary operations of this agency.

As I said on Wednesday, the committee is to be commended for having reduced the amount requested from $20,200,000 to $15,000,000, and it is on entirely sound ground when it reported that "this reduction is believed justified in view of the current outlook for agriculture and the probable changes from surpluses to shortages in many of the commodities normally handled by the Corporation."

This positive fact, that the Corporation will not be called upon to incur in the coming fiscal year anything remotely resembling the costs resulting from the purchase, storage, handling, and sale of many of the commodities it has dealt with during the current fiscal year, is proven beyond any possible question by two kinds of evidence.

First, the committee members and, in particular, the able chairman of the subcommittee, brought this out forcibly in their questioning of this Agency's witnesses. I want to quote portions of this evidence from seven parts of the hearings. They are as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Trigg, last year I asked about the employees who do not have any work to do. We were told that you attempt to keep all the folks busy and find something for them to do. Now that we have reached a problem in manpower, why not let some of them go instead of trying to find some made work for them. You are asking here for the same number of employees, the same amount of money to operate the CCC that you had last year when it is evident there is going to be a decrease in the operations carried on by the Commodity Credit Corporation. How can we justify a request of that kind to the Congress? (p. 117).

Let me repeat for emphasis the words of our colleague, "when it is evident there is going to be a decrease in the operations carried on by the Commodity Credit Corporation."

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, let us just get down to brass tacks. I think you will admit, under the present outlook, that you will not have one-half the volume of commodities for the Commodity Credit Corporation next year that you have had this year, will you not?

* * * * *

Mr. WHITTEN. I cannot see where the CCC will be called upon to handle a volume this year anything like it had last year, and yet your estimate for personnel and for administrative funds for next year is the same as for this year. I think you ought to reconsider that.

* * * * *

Mr. WHITTEN. Whether you can or cannot agree is not the point. I am asking you whether you think the estimate is one that we can justify before the Congress. If it happens to be out of line just a little bit, you can come back and ask for additional funds (p. 118).

This latter suggestion is entirely sound and, as I see it, does not run counter to the provisions of the Antideficiency Appropriation Act. In any event, it is a practice which has certainly been followed, and only recently by this very agency.

I call your attention to the estimate by the chairman of the subcommittee that the volume of commodities would be reduced by at least one-half. This has a definite bearing upon the amendment which I intend to offer when this section of the bill is reached.

Mr. WHITTEN. But, as I was pointing out, you will not be handling as big a volume of commodities for one thing.

Mr. TRIGG. Of course, we will not. * * *

Mr. WHITTEN. We should set these figures of administrative expensse knowing today that there is every probability that you will handle less volume. If the situation gets out of hand later, you could then come back and ask for more employees for the CCC (p. 119).

* * * * *

Mr. WHITTEN. Again, I am not suggesting a major reduction in expenses. I am just discussing the difference between $17,000,000 and $20,000,000 or $15,000,000 for that purpose. I think your figures can stand a lot of study for the next fiscal year (p. 119).

Mr. HORAN. I just want to point out that we have revised our thinking, too, up here in Congress, and the Korean war and the defense effort has caused that. The average cost has gone up, and I think that you as taxpayers are looking to us to do what we can to hold down costs wherever we can, to see that any of these items are justified in reality, and I am disturbed about the size and the shape of this particular item. I do not want to do anything to hurt the Commodity Credit Corporation. I realize what it means, but along with the chairman and the rest of this subcommittee, we need your cooperation on this. We want to do what we are supposed to do, but frankly I am still at a loss as to why this item should be increased (p. 132).

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. HORAN, I think you have proven our case. The testimony up to this point is that last May and June the Commodity Credit Corporation made a survey and arrived at how much manpower it would take to handle a given volume on a per unit basis. Then they multiplied that by the volume, and they came up with this $20,200,000, which includes the $3,850,000 they are asking for now. They cannot sustain that because they will not have that volume.

Mr. BEACH. It appears that way.

Mr. WHITTEN. You just said it was that. You said last May and June you worked up the unit cost, coming up with $20,000,000. Now, you come up with the same number of dollars, so you are bound to have used the same volume. You may have some difference from one program to another but you are using approximately the same volume in total. You cannot justify it.

* * * * *

Mr. WHITTEN. If you handle much less in commodities you will not have as much work to do as in handling a big volume of the commodities. You have arrived at your total demand for funds by multiplying the unit cost times the volume (pp. 132–133).

May I call attention to the undeniable truth of the statement by the chairman of the subcommittee, that this budget estimate was completely unrealistic, and that it could not be justified. I submit that that in itself properly raises in the minds of those of us who are not members of the Appropriations Committee substantial doubt as to whether the Agency furnished the subcommittee with any kind of yardstick or formula upon which a definite recommendation could be made and defended.

Mr. WHITTEN. Now, the Commodity Credit Corporation's activities—you cannot have anything like the volume of work through the Commodity Credit Corporation next year that you had this year (p. 534).

The second class of evidence is from the records of the agency itself.

In the data I inserted in the RECORD for May 9 at page 5224 I pointed out that between June 30, 1950, and March 31, 1951, this agency's holdings in butter, cheese, dried milk, and dried eggs had dropped from 677,401,610 pounds to 171,701,878 pounds. I also submitted figures for 16 other commodities showing very heavy decreases in inventories, which is true of the trend of all such holdings. It bears out clearly the truth of the statement made by the chairman of the subcommittee when he brought out the inherent weakness in the justifications presented by this agency.

Finally, I would like to call attention to the record of the administration expense limitations for this agency between 1938 and 1949, inclusive. In terms of millions of dollars, it is as follows:

1938	0.5
1939	.7
1940	2.0
1941	2.3
1942	3.5
1943	4.4
1944	5.4
1945	7.2
1946	8.9
1947	8.8
1949	8.1
1950	15.4
1951	20.2
Estimated, 1952	20.2

I call attention to the 1949 item of $8,100,000. In terms of the postwar period, and particularly in terms of the excessively large 1948 crops, it might be fairly argued that such a figure could well be used as a measuring rod as against the request made by this agency for the next fiscal year. In any event, surely somewhere between that figure and the $15,000,000 contained in the bill is the clear area within which this House should reach its determination.

The amendment which I intend to propose will be submitted on the basis of these facts and any others that I may be able to develop between now and the time when this section of the bill is reached.

Migratory Farm Labor—H. R. 3283, the Poage Bill, Compared With the Recommendations of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3283 is an amendment to the Agriculture Act of 1949, adding Title V—Agricultural workers. Although the President's Commission on Migratory Labor had been holding hearings and investigations for some 6 or 7 months previously and its report was completed early this year, our committee has apparently ignored the work of this Commission and the recommendations it has made. Where it deals with the same matters, this bill is contrary to the recommendations of the Commission.

RECRUITMENT OF MEXICAN WORKERS

Section 501 provides for the recruiting of agricultural workers from Mexico pursuant to arrangements made between the United States and Mexico; for the establishment and operation of reception centers near places of actual entry of such workers into the United States; the provision of transportation for such workers from recruitment centers outside the United States to reception centers, and transportation from such reception centers to recruitment centers at the termination of employment. It further provides for subsistence, emergency medical care and limited burial expenses as may become necessary during such transportation or while such workers are at reception centers. The Secretary of Labor is authorized to assist the free and voluntary negotiation of contracts between such workers and employers and to guarantee the performance by employers of the provisions of such contracts.

Section 502 provides that no workers shall be made available under this title to any employer unless such employer enters into an agreement with the United States to indemnify the United States against loss by reason of its guaranty of such employer's contracts, and to reimburse the United States for essential expenses incurred for transportation and subsistence.

Section 503 provides that no workers recruited under this title shall be available for any employment in any area unless the regional director of Employment Security of the United States Department of Labor in such area has determined and certified that sufficient domestic workers who are qualified for such work are not available at the time and place when needed and that the employment of such Mexican workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed.

The foregoing interrelated provisions are sharply in contrast with the recommendations of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor. The report of the President's Commission places the greatest emphasis on the use of migratory American farm labor. The report says that—

> First reliance [should] be placed on using our domestic labor force more effectively.

They then recommend that no special measures be adopted to increase the number of alien contract laborers above the number admitted in 1950. They recognize that there might be some need for additional agricultural labor than can be recruited within the borders of the United States and recommend that preference be given to citizens of the offshore areas of the United States such as Hawaii and Puerto Rico. Their fourth recommendation under this heading is that future efforts be directed toward supplying agricultural labor needs with American workers and eliminating dependence on foreign labor.

DISCRIMINATES AGAINST AMERICAN WORKERS

The Poage bill provides for the payment of transportation costs and maintenance during travel of foreign workers from recruitment to reception centers; but there is no such provision for domestic workers. It is left unclear in the bill whether the employer will pay the cost of transportation from the reception center to the place of employment or whether such cost can be deducted from wages; but it is expected that the employer will pay the cost. American migratory workers are not given equal treatment with imported Mexican workers. They do not receive travel expenses and subsistence and medical care of any kind. This prejudices the opportunity to use domestic labor more effectively. The Department of Labor testified that the provision of transportation for American workers would increase the mobility of the farm labor supply and provide more American workers for farm employment.

H. R. 3283 is essentially a bill dealing with the import of Mexican farm labor with some guaranty of fair treatment backed up by the United States. It omits consideration of the problems of mobilization and full utilization of domestic agricultural labor, while the recruitment of American citizens of the offshore areas of the United States is also disregarded. Giving to the regional director of the Bureau of Employment Security the specific authority to certify that domestic workers are not available is not the way to utilize the full manpower resources of the United States because the regional director in an independent status is in no position to determine the availability of workers outside his region, because there should be interregional clearance of available workers, and also because even the most upright men located in particular localities are greatly influenced by the surrounding pressures. The Mexican Government has already stated that it will not deal with numerous separate State authorities. Added to this is the drawback that the low wages paid Mexican imports and wetbacks decreases the attractiveness of these jobs to American workers in many localities.

Regarding the actual recruitment of alien contract labor in American agriculture, the President's Commission recommended that no employer, employer's representative, or association of employers or labor contractor should be permitted to contract directly with foreign workers for employment in the United States, although they may participate in the selection of qualified workers when all other requirements of legal importation are fulfilled. The Commission was so much impressed with the abuses of foreign-labor recruiting and contracting that it recommended that the Immigration and Naturalization Service be the principal contracting agency and that private employers should secure their foreign workers exclusively from the Immigration and Naturalization Service. They specified that, after certifying the need for foreign workers, the United States Employment Service should have no administrative responsibilities in connection with any foreign labor program. The Immigration and Naturalization Service would deliver the imported workers to the farm employers who have submitted the necessary applications and bonds and who have signed individual work agreements. They recommended that in its general supervision of employment of foreign workers the Immigration and Naturalization Service should be authorized to terminate any contract of employment and remove the workers or to refuse to supply any foreign workers to any employer when there has been repeated or willful violation of previous agreements, or when there is reasonable doubt that the terms of the current agreement are being observed.

WAGES

The Poage bill provides for the guaranty by the United States of the amounts owed by employers under the individual contracts for wages and transportation; but it makes no general provision for the amount of wages which must be paid for work performed. The agreement with the Mexican Government is supposed to provide for the payment of wages prevailing in the community for work of a similar nature paid American workers. There is, however, no machinery provided under this bill for determining prevailing wages or to make certain that they will not reflect the miserable wages being paid wetbacks, and,

shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$3,000", and insert "$400."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$6,788.25", and insert "$2,400."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMIL SBARBORI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2363) for the relief of Emil Sbarbori.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Emil Sbarbori, of Jersey City, N. J., the sum of $815. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical expenses, and loss of earning power sustained as a result of a collision on September 6, 1943, on Route No. 25, Elizabeth, N. J., between an automobile in which he was a passenger and a United States Navy station wagon No. 17791, driven by an enlisted man of the Navy, operating from the United States Navy, Department of Supervisor of Shipbuilding, 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "appropriated," strike out the bill down to the colon in line 4, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof "to Mr. and Mrs. Emil Sbarbori, of Jersey City, N. J., the sum of $375; to Edna Perfetti, of Union City, N. J., the sum of $125; to Anthony Perfetti, of Union City, N. J., the sum of $20, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and medical expenses sustained as a result of a collision of September 6, 1943, on Route numbered 25, Elizabeth, N. J., between an automobile in which they were passengers and a United States Navy station wagon, numbered 17791, driven by a Navy employee, operating from the United States Navy, Department of Supervisor of Shipbuilding, 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Emil Sbarbori, Edna Perfetti, and Anthony Perfetti."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN R. HARRIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2453) for the relief of John R. Harris.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John R. Harris, Scranton, Pa., the sum of $326.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said John R. Harris against the United States for reimbursement of the cost of travel performed by his wife Mary P. Harris from Scranton, Pa., to Paris, France, in March 1948, while he was serving in Paris as an officer with the Quartermaster Corps, Headquarters, American Graves Registration Command, European area: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$326.50", and insert "$201."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LULA M. WHITEBEAR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3216) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Lula M. Whitebear.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Lula M. Whitebear a patent in fee to the following-described lands allotted to her on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.: The east half of section 11, the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter, the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter and the south half of the southwest quarter, section 12, and the northeast quarter of section 14, township 8 south, range 37 east, Montana principal meridian, containing six hundred and forty acres.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Lula" and insert "Lulu."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Lulu M. Whitebear."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NICOLETTA AND GUILIA PONTRELLI

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 756) for the relief of Nicoletta and Guilia Pontrelli, with an amendment of the Senate thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 10, after "Pontrelli", insert ": *Provided*, That there be given a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, to the United States and to all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof holding the United States and all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof harmless against Nicoletta Pontrelli becoming a public charge."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUISE LEITZINGER AND DAUGHTER

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1722) for the relief of Louis Leitzinger and her daughter, with an amendment of the Senate thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 14 and 15 and insert "date of the payment by them of the required visa fees and head taxes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSE ENCARNACION ORTIZ

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1823) for the relief of Jose Encarnacion Ortiz, with an amendment of the Senate thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 10, strike out "Upon the enactment of this act" and insert "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 55]

Anfuso	Frazier	Magee
Angell	Gary	Miller, Calif.
Beall	Gillette	Miller, N. Y.
Belcher	Gordon	Morgan
Boykin	Gregory	Morrison
Buckley	Gwinn	Murphy
Byrne, N. Y.	Harden	Murray, Wis.
Celler	Harrison, Va.	Pickett
Chiperfield	Herlong	Powell
Colmer	Herter	Rogers, Tex.
Coudert	Irving	Short
Cox	Jackson, Wash.	Taylor
Dawson	Jonas	Whitaker
Dempsey	Jones, Hamilton C.	Woodruff
Dingell	Kersten, Wis.	
Eberharter		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 383 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. MITCHELL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 158, Rept. No. 447), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Works, effective, from January 3, 1951, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (o) of the Rules of the House of Representatives. For such purpose such committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories and possessions, and the Dominion of Canada, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued only over the signature of the chairman of the committee or a member of the committee designated by him; they may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee may report to the House of Representatives from time to time during the present Congress the results of its studies and investigations, with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3973, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Thursday, May 10, the Clerk had read through and including line 25 on page 26 of the bill. If there are no amendments to be offered at this point, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FLOOD CONTROL

For expenses necessary, in accordance with the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law 738), as amended and supplemented to make preliminary examinations and surveys, and to perform works of improvement, and to plan the agricultural phases of the development of the Columbia Basin area, the Arkansas-White-Red River area, and the New England-New York area, in accordance with the provisions of laws relating to the activities of the Department, including not to exceed $100,000 for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), to remain available until expended, $8,000,000, with which shall be merged the unexpended balances of funds heretofore appropriated or transferred to the Department for flood-control purposes: *Provided,* That no part of such funds shall be used for the purchase of lands in the Yazoo and Little Tallahatchie watersheds without specific approval of the county board of supervisors of the county in which such lands are situated, nor shall any part of such funds be used for the purchase of lands in the counties of Adair, Cherokee, and Sequoyah, in the State of Oklahoma, without the specific approval of the board of county commissioners of the county in which such lands are situated: *Provided further,* That of the funds available herein, not in excess of $6,000,000 (with which shall be merged the unexpended balance of funds heretofore made available for these purposes) may be expended in watersheds heretofore authorized by section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, for necessary gully control, floodwater detention, and floodway structures in areas other than those over which the Department of the Army has jurisdiction and responsibility.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: On page 27, line 14, strike out "$8,000,000," and insert $6,112,800."

(Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will give to this particular division the same amount of new money which was given to them for the 1951 fiscal year. I am proposing to reduce the $8,000,000 now in the bill to $6,112,800. Let me call to your attention how a division or a bureau keeps on growing and growing. In 1947 we gave to this particular small division only the sum of $2,101,000. That was upped 50 percent in 1948, giving it about $3,000,000 of new money. In 1949 the appropriation was doubled and the Congress gave them $6,000,000. In 1950 we gave this bureau $9,500,000. In 1951 we gave them $10,312,000.

What happened to the $10,312,000 that the Congress last year said was necessary? If you will recall the Congress instructed the President under the one-package bill last year, and mistakenly so, to make a $550,000,000 reduction at his discretion in the one-package bill. The Congress was too worn out by the length of time that bill required to clear the House to do its work properly.

I hold it is the responsibility of the Congress under the Constitution to control the purse. The President, in order to achieve that $550,000,000 cut last year, took from this particular item the sum of $4,200,000. To my mind by that action, the administration stated that they had little confidence themselves in this particular program as it was being operated. It is disturbing, Mr. Chairman, to note this fact and I wish you would turn to page 772 of the hearings and see where the chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], stated:

I notice last year that you had reductions under section 1214 of the appropriation bill. You took a cut of $4,200,000. How were you able to do that? Where did you absorb that amount of money?

Mr. Phillips, Mr. Wills' assistant, replied:

About $200,000, Mr. Chairman, from preliminary examinations and surveys and about $4,000,000 from works of improvement.

Mr. WHITTEN. You just held up the works of improvement to that extent?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is right.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the amount cut by the President under section 1214 was applied in the main to the actual work involved in flood control. Only $200,000 was taken from the large item, preliminary surveys.

Think of them spending $1,700,000 for surveys at a time when we already have 171 preliminary surveys of watersheds and full survey reports on 19 projects. Here we are in the position of actually working on only 11 watersheds, half of that work being done in two States, Mississippi and Texas, and yet when this group were told by the President that it would be necessary to take off $4,200,000 of the 1951 appropriation, did they take the bulk of that from the preliminary survey work? Oh, no. According to Mr. Phillips' statement, just quoted, $4,000,000 of the $4,200,000 reduction was saved at the expense of the actual work of construction, while $1,700,000 was expended for the further preliminary survey work and a continued program of that kind which surely could have been dispensed with rather than to reduce by half the actual flood-control work last year.

Mr. Chairman, the cut which I propose through this amendment should be applied largely at the expense of preliminary examinations and surveys. Please keep in mind, as I mentioned previously, that here is one division of Government which has grown by leaps and bounds since 1947. These people asked only $2,100,000 for this work in 1947. They very modestly increased their request to $3,500,000 for 1948. Then they jumped the request almost threefold to $9,004,000 for 1949, hiked it to $10,000,000 in 1951, and in 1951 they apparently decided there was no limit to our Treasury and unblushingly came before us and asked for $11,700,000 for the very same

division which received less than one-fifth of that amount only 4 years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am trying to follow the gentleman's statement. I am having some difficulty in reconciling the gentleman's statement with the report. On page 13 of the report the committee states that this item has been reduced from last year's appropriation by $1,201,575. Is that correct?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The report is not clear, I think. I am referring to the new money that we are putting into this particular activity. Last year this particular activity had a little over $6,100,000 of new money given to it. My amendment would give to it the very same amount for this coming fiscal year. It seems that the report takes into consideration moneys which are available from previous years.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I still do not understand how you could have a reduction. The report shows less money is to be spent than last year. I just cannot reconcile the statement the gentleman makes with the report.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If the gentleman will turn to page 752 of the hearings, he will see that there is appropriated for 1952, $6,112,800. That is the figure I am operating upon. That is the base figure.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. Would the gentleman tell us how it is we have a flood-control appropriation in an Agricultural Department appropriation bill?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Well, that is a puzzle to me. Of course, the responsibility of the Army engineers only goes to a certain point on these rivers. Above that you have the Department of Agriculture, on the small tributaries leading down in; and the Department of Agriculture, in turn, divides its work between the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service, and they, in turn, call in the Extension Service, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the Production and Marketing Administration, and two or three others. I think we should put all of this work which the Army engineers do not take care of under one group, the Soil Conservation Service.

Mr. GRANGER. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We should stop, look, and listen. Let us take a little money out of this appropriation, and then let us request, through the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the kind of investigation we should have, and find out exactly what we are doing and why it is necessary to pile up a great number of preliminary surveys at a tremendous cost, when we all want the actual construction work performed as soon as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. D'EWART. On page 13 of the report it is stated that the Forest Service and Soil Conservation Service have a primary responsibility for this work and that the work is to prepare surveys for the installation of watershed improvements, control of water runoff and water flow, protection from soil erosion and so forth. Is it the opinion of the gentleman that this $6,000,000 that will be left could be used for range improvement in place of the $500,000 that was stricken from the bill under the Forest Service item the other day?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not think this particular item has to do with that matter specifically but the language is broad enough to perhaps permit such use, if I understand the gentleman correctly.

Mr. D'EWART. No; reseeding of the ranges, holding water in the national forests.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I certainly agree with the gentleman that this money could be spent to better advantage.

All I want to do, I may state to the gentleman from Montana, is to stop, look, listen, and see where we are going.

Mr. D'EWART. It would appear to me since part of this money is to be used by the Forest Service and since it is to retard stream flow that it could well be used for the purposes I have mentioned and in cooperative range management.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I would not want to commit myself on that.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. Is there any provision made on the part of sponsoring agencies for this improvement?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Yes; to a certain degree. It is cooperative; it varies. Some places they even cooperate to the extent of 50 or 60 percent.

Mr. GRANGER. That sometimes just to the extent of furnishing rights-of-way?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Sometimes to the extent of very little, if any.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, we all have a very high regard for our friend from Minnesota and his desire to save public money. As you may have noticed, his knowledge of this program does not come from having any of it in his district; I mean this cut would not reach Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I correct the gentleman? There is an item that reaches Minnesota, 1 of the 11.

Mr. WHITTEN. What is the name of the project?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The Little Sioux in Iowa in Minnesota, the third largest. The two other projects, if the gentleman will yield, are in Mississippi and Texas. The States of Mississippi and Texas get more than half of this money.

Mr. WHITTEN. Of course, he groups Mississippi and Texas; I do not know what is spent in Texas, but I know the amount in Mississippi is very small as compared to the total amount in this bill, and much, much smaller when compared with the costs of the dams built there.

The question has been asked: Why put flood control in the Department of Agriculture? Mr. Chairman, let us get this matter of funds straight. Last year there was a carry-over of $3,000,000 which with the amount appropriated gave a total of $13,401,000 of funds available for work this year. With the President's reduction of $4,200,000 we have available for the present year $9,200,000. I want you to know that your committee has brought in reductions, because the amount available this year, $9,200,000, was reduced by the budget to $8,900,000. Your committee then reduced that amount by $900,000 leaving $8,000,000, as against available funds for this year of $9,200,000.

I have never made any special pleas since I have been a Member of this Congress for my district, but I do thing I have the right to ask for fair play. This is a construction program, this is a case of building projects, it is a program where the States and local people put up approximately 50 percent of the cost. Let us see whether what we are asking here is fair treatment. I want to use this by way of illustration because, as I say, while some of this is in my district, we have cut it in the same way that we have cut every other item in this bill by more than 10 percent.

We have cut it as against funds available this year by 15 percent. This Congress provided funds of about $56,000,000 and went down into my area—they authorized it before I came here—and the $75,000,000 of Federal funds will be used to close up the outlets of four rivers, two are now closed and two more will be closed. The Congress appropriated the money. You have already spent $56,000,000 of it. You did not require any contribution from the folks below these dams as their contribution. When you stopped up those four rivers the effect of their being stopped up was felt in every ditch clear on up to the headwaters. Not only did you flood the land of the man in that area but the man that was back of it, where you did not take his land and

where you did not pay him a dime damage by stopping up the outlet of that stream, and you made his little ditches close up, too, but when you passed this legislation for those four dams you said: "We are going to provide as a part of this for flood control work above the dam, we are going to pay 50 percent of the cost."

You did not do that for the fellow below the dam. But after two of these dams have been built, after the effects are being felt, notwithstanding the fact that the farmers in the area put up 50 percent of the cost, you say: "No, the dams are there, but we are going to take our own good time before we live up to the other obligation and try to relieve the ill effects that we have visited on you."

Those people did not want the dams, they opposed the dams, and I say that the Congress of the United States has an obligation to carry out the commitment that you made when you put these dams on those folks down there and spent $75,000,000 without any contribution locally at all. Under this program the local people have to put up 50 percent.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is it not a fact that the Appropriations Committee over the protest of the people in the area appropriated money for the construction of those dams that visited these hardships upon the people of our district?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is correct, and under this amendment you would welch on your agreement to go ahead with these construction projects. These are construction projects and if you want to save money and you are committed to building something, is it helping any to drag out the period of time in which they are being built? Everything is going up, up, up. Do you save any money by needlessly dragging it out? I cannot see that.

Again I want to say to you that this is a cooperative program. The Government has committed itself in times past and your committee has reduced it by more than 10 percent. You have already put these dams there and flooded the land of these people, it has had this effect on the local streams. I say you owe it to them not to drag out this situation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We want to do what is right about this particular matter. On page 765 of the hearings the gentleman asked this question of Mr. Phillips, assistant to Mr. Will:

> I notice last year you had a reduction under section 1214 of the appropriation bill, you took a cut of $4,200,000. How were you able to do that? Where did you absorb that money?

Mr. Phillips replied:

> About $200,000, Mr. Chairman, was taken from preliminary examinations and surveys and about $4,000,000 from construction.

Now, that is what they did about the construction item the gentleman is talking about. They only took $200,000 from $1,500,000 that we gave them for preliminary surveys yet, according to the statement in the RECORD they took $4,000,000 off the actual construction money.

What is wrong? There is something wrong in the administration of the whole matter.

Mr. WHITTEN. The administration of it, as the gentleman knows, is not in this item, but the administration of it is in the Secretary's Office and in the Soil Conservation and in the Forest Service. Of course, they had to hold it up. They had their reasons for this. They had their appropriation, and the President cut off $4,000,000. What else could they do? They did not have the money; they could not spend it. We have made the same reduction here that we have made elsewhere. I plead with you to be fair. There is hardly a Member of this House who has not on occasion been before the committee. We have tried to be fair with you; we have tried to be fair with these projects. We have given the same cut here that we have given elsewhere in this bill, and I urge you, in view of the situation we have, and in view of the fact that the Congress brought it about, that you have an obligation, and you are not spending any money here needlessly. You are carrying out your commitments where the farmers put up 50 percent of the cost.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Will the gentleman tell us wheher or not these projects are under construction at the present time?

Mr. WHITTEN. They are in each of these cases.

Mr. GRANGER. They are all projects that are being constructed.

Mr. WHITTEN. Absolutely. The Congress has committeed itself to the completion of these projects and, as I say, in my own area the project was made necessary because you appropriated $75,000,000 to stop up four rivers on the poor folks that live up above them. We said, "We will help you out of it, but you have to put up 50 percent of the cost" but now under this amendment you would be welching on that. I believe the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, and I do it for this reason: I have had some experience with surveys in my congressional district, and I know that there is very little interest taken after they get the money to get a survey. In 1944 an amendment of mine passed the House providing for a survey of the Susquehanna River on the North Branch up around my particular section. In 1948 we had a major flood there and there had been no rendition of a report of any kind by any of the authorities until that time, and nobody had any idea what the recommendations were for flood control in spite of the fact that they had citizen meeting after citizen meeting in protest against the deplorable flood conditions.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Does not the gentleman know that survey reports and flood-control work comes entirely within the purview of the Army engineers?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. We talked that point over, and the gentleman from Minnesota, in presenting his amendment, says that there is too much slight-of-hand work under the table anyhow; we will pass too much money around among these different groups, so for that reason, I think we ought to cut them; the whole bunch of them, because they certainly did wrong by my district, and they did not give them any satisfaction whatsoever. Not only that, but they slapped the House of Representatives in the face, because here was a legislative direction for those engineers to go ahead and make an elaborate report on the Susquehanna River in my district there. And what did they do? They lumped it into a big report of the north branch and nobody had any opportunity to know what was going on until just this last year, 6 years after the amendment that I had presented to the House, which was passed by the House and the Senate and approved by the President, and the executive authorities had not gone ahead and done the bidding of the Congress in the matter, so I ask the question, What is the use of having any of these surveys or directing any of these people to go ahead with orders from Congress when they deliberately ignore them?

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. I have no money in this whatsoever; nothing in this appropriation goes to Tennessee, but in all fairness to the gentleman from Mississippi and to the people from Mississippi who did not want these rivers dammed up, if Congress put it on those people against their objections, do you not think it nothing but right for Congress to carry out their commitments and the promises to these people?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Is the gentleman referring to my district?

Mr. SUTTON. I am referring to the time when the gentleman was in Congress and I was, and when the gentleman from Mississippi was here, and when this was passed.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am speaking of an amendment which was adopted by the House directing a survey of flood conditions in my district. They apparently ignored it. They flouted the will of the Congress, and they apparently took the money along with it.

Mr. SUTTON. The gentleman says he wants to go along with cutting this appropriation.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am all for it.

Mr. SUTTON. I know the gentleman wants to economize wherever he can. I am sure the gentleman from New York is one of the top economizers, one of the most economical men in the Congress.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I appreciate that.

Mr. SUTTON. However, we made a promise to these people, we made this pledge to them. In all fairness, does not the gentleman believe we should carry out this pledge?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am wholeheartedly in agreement with the gentleman's contention.

Mr. SUTTON. At the same time, the gentleman does want to carry out the promise we made to them?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am simply pointing out that the will of the Congress was flouted in the matter, and the people of my district, at least, never got any satisfaction out of legislation which was designed to improve the flood conditions in the district.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not know whether the survey to which the gentleman refers comes under the Army engineers or the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. It is the principle of the thing.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. However, if the gentleman will permit, I should like to quote from page 765 of the hearings:

Mr. WHITTEN. This committee, in an effort to understand better how the Department of Agriculture operates, and to check on some of the reports that have come to us, had an investigation made of the activities of the various units within the Department, one of which was the flood-control program. I quote here from a report:

"No detailed examination of the United States Department of Agriculture flood-control program was made. However, from the limited examination made, it appears that the same multiplicity of United States Department of Agriculture bureaus, with the resultant duplication and overlap, exists in this program as in the soil-conservation programs. As one Government official stated, 'the United States Department of Agriculture is trying to load the flood-control budget with many other United States Department of Agriculture bureaus. This is uneconomical and is stifling the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service which have been delegated primary responsibility for flood control by the Secretary of Agriculture'."

Those are the words of an investigator our committee put to work on the job. The gentleman cannot tell me that there is not considerable we should look into in this particular case.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The reason I am supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota is that this is the very thing that happened in my district. I hate to see the people get a run-around. I hate to see the legislative authority of the Congress challenged. They simply make fools of all of us when they do not carry out the mandates Congress passes.

In my district, according to the headlines of the Gannett newspapers, lurid headlines on the front page, beef is going up 28 percent, after the order to roll back the cattlemen's prices. I wonder what is going to happen when the packers take their cut. Are the people of my district going to have to pay about 25 percent more for their meat than they are now? It is something we all ought to consider, and see that this Price Administrator gets a talking to from the people of the United States.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KENNEDY as a substitute to the amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

On page 27, line 14, strike out "$8,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,500,000."

On page 28, line 4, strike out "$6,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,800,000."

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would cut the appropriation from $8,000,000 to $2,500,000, of which not more than $1,800,000 may be expended in watersheds heretofore authorized for necessary gully control, floodwater detention, and floodway structures in areas other than those over which the Department of the Army has jurisdiction and responsibility.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. Would the gentleman object to an amendment providing that the Federal Government knock out all these dams, and let the water down on those people who live in the areas affected?

Mr. KENNEDY. I would.

In addition to the $2,500,000 which would be available, I think we can anticipate there will be a carry-over of up to $2,000,000 from last year's appropriation. In 1949 there was a carry-over from the previous year. From 1949 to 1950 there was a carry-over of over $1,250,000. From 1950 through 1951 there was a carry-over of over $3,000,000. Of last year's appropriation, which was $9,000,000-odd, the total funds obligated as of April 30, are about $6,000,000, which means there is an unobligated balance of over $3,000,000. So that we can anticipate at that rate of expenditure that there will be a carry-over this year, as there has been in past years, of up to $2,000,000, which will mean the total appropriation, if my substitute is accepted, will be nearly $4,500,000. I do not think there is any doubt that this program can stand this cut.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is it not a fact that during the war this entire program was practically cut out?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes; I believe it was.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That in itself would show that it is one of those so-called nonessentials that we can certainly go slow with at this time.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes. I believe this program is most worth while, but I do believe it can be postponed. Many of these programs are not of an emergency nature, and can be delayed until another year, when the situation may not be as critical. I note that the report of the committee said that these projects did not use critical and strategic material. I certaily think a dollar this year is a critical and strategic material, and I do not think we ought to go ahead with projects which are not of a defense nature.

While this whole program is intended to increase the agricultural productivity of this country over a long-range period of time, I think many of these projects which are of a general benefit to the country can be postponed to another year when we are not in as critical a period.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman from Minnesota said that this program was curtailed during the war. That is true. But, may I point out, that we did not have any flood control or any soil conservation program for 100 years in this country. Is that any reason why we should not have it now?

Mr. KENNEDY. No. I think he was making reference to a previous critical period when the dollar was in short supply. The point has been raised by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] as to whether work on these watersheds has already begun. It is true that the 11 big watersheds have work already commenced on them.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. But these watersheds are divided into sub-water-sheds. Many of these have not had work commenced on them, and I think many of these can be postponed to another year.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Construction is actually underway on 11 authorized projects, and my contention is that it is wasting money to continue this everlasting job of piling up preliminary reports on top of one another which we may never use for the next 20 or 30 years.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes, I was trying to point out to the gentleman that these 11 watersheds are divided into sub-water-sheds and many of these sub-water-sheds have not had work commenced on them, and they can be postponed until another year. I think there is no clear-cut connection between this work this year and defense this year. This program is for the purpose of increasing the productivity of agriculture in many areas of the country over a long-range period. I am for that. But I think this year, having a heavy financial deficit, many of these projects can be postponed until another time when we are not in such critical condition. I think we ought to spend money this year only when it has defense implication. I do not think anyone can argue that this is a case of spending money for defense. There will be over $4,000,000 at the end of this year for expenditures for this purpose. Emergency conditions can be dealt with and the others can be postponed over a longer period of time.

I believe this substitute should be accepted by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has expired.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have no purpose today in rising to talk on this proposition except to be fair. I tried to find out something about this particular provision of the bill. If you will recall, I asked some questions during general debate about this part of the bill. We have some excellent programs that are nationwide. We have the Forest Service program, which I have always strongly supported. The Soil Conservation Service has done an outstanding job. The PMA has done an outstanding job on soil conservation. I shall speak on that subject later on.

Here we have joint responsibility. We have the responsibility of the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service. Apparently, sometime, due to an act of Congress, an over-all program was set up above that, which, as near as I have been able to find out, is a duplication of the effort of the Forest Service and the soil Conservation Service. In looking at the hearings on this particular bill, I want to emphasize that this program was practically discontinued during the war years 1942 to 1947, but lest we get confused, on page 750 of the hearings, in talking about the number of positions we have "Estimated Positions, 1,033 Federal employees." Those employees are working on this particular program which, as near as I have been able to determine, appears to be a duplication.

In addition to that, we have over half of the money going for salaries. So when we talk in terms of what we are going to do as far as contracts and the fixing up of these things is concerned, over half of this money goes for personal services; duplication.

There is a group set up here that will hold a conference with people who are charged with the responsibility of doing the work. We have the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service. In addition to that we have to have a group over and above that to get those two agencies to come together in a conference and decide what they are going to do.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am very glad the gentleman is emphasizing that part, because he and I both want to see emphasis placed upon actual construction work in this particular division. I want to reiterate that when $4,200,000 was cut off last fall the flood-control group themselves took $4,000,000 of that off of construction, and only decreased their survey work by $200,000.

Mr. MARSHALL. My good friend from Minnesota is a farmer and he knows, as I do, that conservation is not conservation until it is an accomplished fact on the land. That is where it has to be. We can talk all we want to about planning, we can talk all we want about schemes of how we are going to control things, but until those things are actually carried out it does not amount to a saving to anybody. It is a matter of piling up salaries, it is a matter of piling up expenses, it is a matter of piling up detailed data which, after all, becomes obsolete. Most of the things that we ask for in the matter of surveys have to be resurveyed again because of costs. The things in this particular bill for construction will have to all be gone over as a matter of cost, to determine what will be done.

I say this is one of the places where we can save some money and it is not going to harm anybody. A little later on we will get into some phases of the agricultural program that we are all interested in, that will save our soil—conservation practices, and all that sort of thing. This is something that can be just as well set aside. The proof of the pudding is in the eating, and the proof is that it was set aside during the war years 1942 to 1947.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] is in position to know whereof he speaks because for quite a few years he held a very responsible position in the Department of Agriculture working in our State of Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to try to procure the assistance of the gentleman from Mississippi, chairman of the committee, in getting the record straight.

Both of our distinguished friends from Minnesota have said that there is no justification for piling up a large number of surveys, and I agree with that. Yet, a consistent program of planning and survey work should be carried on. Certain new projects should be started. But I should like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi how much of the money in this bill as it comes before the committee is for surveys of new projects?

Mr. WHITTEN. The committee made no special set-aside at all for surveys. Out of the funds available they have made some surveys, and it is estimated that such examinations and surveys under the budget estimate was $1,784,000. I understand this work is being carried on in 11 watersheds. I know, being on this committee, how many able Members of Congress and others have been on delegations urging this type of work which is badly needed in many areas. The only way you can start a project is to have something you can check against.

I do not know whether the purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota is just a straight cut, or to have the cut applied to the elimination of surveys and reallocated for construction work. Just what he has in mind I do not know.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Certainly the purpose of the gentleman from Minnesota is to decrease to $250,000 the sum requested by the Department for preliminary surveys. I might say to the gentleman, if he will permit, the figure on the completed preliminary surveys is 171 watersheds, according to page 755 of the hearings, but we are actually working on only eleven.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman. I should like to find out from the gentleman whether his amendment would slow down construction on projects in basins which are already under construction.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I doubt whether it would on big projects, I may say to the gentleman from Oklahoma, because they have a large carry-over. At the most it would affect them to the extent of about one-fifth in work that they would do for this coming year if the Department of Agriculture would do what we are aiming at; that is, to take the bulk of this cut from preliminary surveys and also save on other items that they have requested which have very little to do with actual construction.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman. I am glad to have that statement in the record. I would hate to see work on projects under construction slowed down.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I feel that if we were assured that the money would be spent mainly where we want it to be spent, on actual construction, that following the passing of this present emergency the Congress would be well justified in putting up $20,000,000 or $25,000,000 a year until these particular projects are completed. This work is important. We must stop the water upstream as much as possible and prevent it from flooding the lower areas. We have a vast field to work in. I hope all of this will eventually be turned over to one agency, preferably the Soil Conservation Service, and help that agency do the sort of a job on the upper watersheds as the Army engineers is now doing with the navigable rivers.

Mr. ALBERT. I agree with the gentleman because we are spending on some of the large dams on these watersheds as much as $250,000,000. For a relatively small amount we can construct small dams and do soil conservation work that will prevent silting, that will preserve these great reservoirs on which the taxpayers have spent many millions of dollars. In my own State the work on the Washita Basin should be speeded and not slowed down, not only to conserve thousands of acres of good land but to protect Lake Texoma. This is a program for the conservation of soil. Contrary to the statement of my friend from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] this is not a program which duplicates any other program. The regular program of the Soil Conservation Service dovetails into this program, but under that program, construction projects such as these are not possible. On the other hand, the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have no authority to go down and build these small dams on creeks and small tributaries of the larger streams.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] was not referring to duplication as far as the Army engineers are concerned. He was referring to duplication within the Department. We have about seven different agencies getting their fingers into this pie and all I am asking by my amendment is to stop, look, listen and straighten the thing out before we go ahead with further expenditure of many millions of dollars.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. Will the gentleman from Minnesota amend his amendment to cut out all surveys and let the construction go ahead?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I could not agree to that.

Mr. SUTTON. I thought that was the purpose of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Well, I want to knock out the bulk of the preliminary surveys but I would not want in case of an emergency, for example, to prevent doing absolutely necessary preliminary or final surveys and mapping.

Mr. SUTTON. Then the gentleman wants to cut out some construction?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Very little. After all we are at war and, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] so well said, we have a strategic material here, the dollar, that we are thinking about today. We must be willing to curtail even the things we favor most.

Mr. SUTTON. What is more strategic than the soil of this country?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in listening to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] one would gather that at some time in the not too distant past some of these agencies had pulled a few dirty tricks on the folks down in his district. The other day I recall listening to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the majority leader, who told us in several different ways that all those who had been listening to the Communists and dealing with them were getting a dirty deal. That is too bad. It is regrettable the State Department and the administration did not realize that fact long ago.

But I am wondering whether some time we are going to get back—and I mean the Congress—and do a little homework for our own folks.

HOMEWORK NEEDS ATTENTION

While hundreds of thousands of men are fighting for "a free world"; while administration spokesmen and Members of Congress are debating how best the American people can make further sacrifices, do more for so-styled "free peoples" and "free nations," some of us have been wondering when this administration and Congress will take effective action to make our people a "free people."

Because of the propaganda put out by those who worry overmuch over the fact that other people in some parts of the world have less of this world's goods, less freedom of action than do we; our own people, those who elect a President, Vice President, and Members of Congress and who pay them, are, because of ever-increasing taxation and regimentation imposed by those who should be their servants, finding it more and more difficult to meet their tax bills, to purchase in the open market at a reasonable price, the things to which they have become accustomed.

But far worse and more harmful in the end is the ever-increasing curtailment of the freedom of the individual to exercise what so many call his "civil rights"—rights guaranteed by the Constitution heretofore exercised by all of us—rights which professional organizations intent upon protecting some civil rights, ignore.

What I am trying to put across is a realization that here in America, "the land of the free," in Georgia, for example, for weeks men and women who desired to work for a livelihood were, by a minority using deadly weapons, forcibly prevented from working.

We all know that if a man and his family would eat, he must—unless he is the object of charity or of someone's generosity—go about his daily task. But here in free America, in Georgia, individuals are not free.

While seeking, through our Armed Forces to bring freedom to a people thousands of miles away—who may resent our efforts, should we not worry a little about our own citizens?

Nor is Georgia the only place in America where men are not free.

The press tells us that in Chicago people—heads of families—cannot purchase milk for family use, for the baby or babies of the family. Why? Because those who distribute milk—which otherwise is available—refuse to permit its delivery.

While we are spending billions of dollars, sacrificing thousands of American lives, to bring about a greater degree of freedom in Asia, would it not be well if we used the laws already on the books to help the farmer sell the milk he produces, give the housewife who has the money, the opportunity to buy the milk she needs?

In Detroit, without notice, individuals who operate the city-owned transportation system have, for weeks—carried on a strike, tied up the city's transportation system.

Result? Thousands of people are forced to seek other methods of transportation. This, despite the fact that Michigan has a law which provides that when a municipal employee goes on strike he loses the job, is no longer an employee. Another law makes it a criminal offense for any individual to interfere with another who seeks to go about his daily task. A union official says, in effect, that the streetcars will not run unless the union's demands are met.

The mayor of Detroit has refused to yield to the demands of the strikers. Presumably, he realizes that if he yields to one demand, shortly others will follow.

Hundreds of thousands of people in Detroit are inconvenienced, some grievously injured because a minority refuses to recognize the law, insists upon having its will imposed upon an overwhelming majority.

And Frank X. Martel, president of the Detroit and Wayne County Federation of Labor, says:

> The DSR (Department of Street Railways) vehicles will appear only on the streets of Detroit when they are operated by members of division 26 (the striking local) under union conditions.

Does this indicate we are a free people?

Will Governor Williams meet the Martel challenge or will he yield to political pressure?

Again, permit me to ask, why should American youth be conscripted for free nations abroad while here at home—in Georgia, in Illinois, and in Michigan—our law-enforcing officers permit, because of expediency, let us say, millions of people to be deprived of their freedom?

Will some who seem to have the cares of the world on their shoulders turn their eyes homeward—do a little home work here before they continue to sacrifice the lives of more and more of our men abroad?

Instead of devoting all our thought and efforts toward the betterment of "free peoples" who do not exist, why not free Americans whose rights are denied them?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in view of what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] just said, that is, that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] apparently felt that someone down in the department had played a trick on him. I think I should make some explanation of what did happen. The trick was played, to use the words of the gentleman from Michigan, on the districts which the gentleman from Mississippi and I have the honor to represent, not by anyone down in any department, but by the Congress of the United States. I do not agree with my colleague that it was exactly a trick. I am simply using his words.

Now here is what happened. In 1936, after the Army engineers had made their reports on the proposed construction of the dams and reservoirs, the Congress authorized their construction. The Congress did this even though the engineers reported the projects to be economically unsound.

The dams were put under construction prior to the war and were subsequently suspended. After the war construction was resumed and the projects are now nearing completion.

So by an act of this Congress the waters of several rivers have been backed over the farms in the north central Mississippi. I think I should add that this was done over the protest of Mr. WHITTEN and myself. We appeared before the Committee on Appropriations and begged committee members not to appropriate money for these projects. We made our case of protest on the basis of the engineers' report and submitted evidence that the projects would utterly destroy many of our farmers. The committee and the Congress, in their wisdom, disagreed; and so the projects were proceeded with. Now that is water over the mill but the effect of the projects on our districts is not. To partially compensate our people and make their burdens as light as possible, this same Congress promised that the back waters and runoff waters would be controlled as much as possible. That is one of the purposes of this particular item in the bill. We were also assured that there would be a good project of erosion control, which would not only benefit such land as we had left, but would control the flow of waters into the reservoirs. Those were firm commitments made to us by this Congress. Now, if you want to cut that out, that is your business; but it seems to me that when and if you do, then it would be nothing but right and fair that you restore the status quo in our districts. Of course, the latter is impossible because the dams and reservoirs are about finished and certainly should be finished with the least possible delay.

All we ask is that you carry out your commitment and give us the water and erosion control projects that were so faithfully promised in consideration of the sacrifice made by our people.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] said a great portion of this money is going to administrative costs. Sure it is. Do you know why? Because the landowners are paying primarily for the actual work. The Government is primarily furnishing technical services through administrative experts and is preparing and presenting plans, all of which naturally throws a large portion of this item to administrative costs. It is more or less an administrative item because the farmers themselves are doing the work. This Congress is building the dams and reservoirs for the benefit of people below the levee free of charge, but as for us above the dams, we are getting technical services only and paying for the work. That is the agreement. Now certainly you are not going back on it.

The gentlemen of the committee have already cut this a reasonable sum, in fact, to a greater percentage than the percentage cut made in other bills that have come to the House. I think the committee has been very reasonable and I feel that we should support the item as is. If you see fit to support either of the pending amendments, that is your privilege. But such action would be most unfair and constitute a breach of agreement with our people. I have faith in your wisdom and fairness and am confident you will vote down the amendments, particularly the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

(Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to propound a question to the chairman of the subcommittee. May I ask just how the pending amendments would affect the Little Sioux River project in northwest Iowa?

Mr. WHITTEN. The Little Sioux project is in the bill for approximately $908,000. The amount of the cut, of course, is much greater than that amount of money. How it would be applied I do not know, but the amount of the cut far exceeds the amount that was set up for the Little Sioux project, in Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. As I understand, the sum now in the bill is $908,000, whereas during the last fiscal year we appropriated $1,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes. The committee has made reductions in our very serious efforts to hold down every project we could. We have even cut those projects which we considered to be vital to some areas.

Mr. HOEVEN. The pending amendments are in the false-economy class. I think my record for economy in Government is equal to that of anyone present. The Little Sioux River project is the pattern for soil-conservation practices throughout the United States. It was set up some years ago, and has been unduly retarded. The proposed amendments would further slow up the soil-conservation work that is being done under the project.

The situation has been particularly aggravated this year due to serious floods in the Little Sioux area. I should tell you that the Little Sioux project is almost entirely within my congressional district. The flooding of the Little Sioux is almost a yearly occurence. Only a few weeks ago people were forced from their homes in Cherokee, Correctionville, and Spencer, in my district. The town of Anthon, due to its peculiar location, is constantly in danger from the flood waters. That situation demands particular attention.

It seems to me that instead of retarding the development of this flood-control project we should at least stop, look, and listen. The Little Sioux project is a thing in being. The work of redeeming the land and stopping the flood waters has been going on for severral years. Our farmers are cooperating, devoting a lot of time and effort and even furnishing their own money to help complete the project. They are using soil conservation practices, are planting shrubbery and trees and are doing everything humanly possible to retain the raindrops where they fall. I therefore feel it is imperative to continue work on the project without interruption, and it should be completed as soon as possible. We are not only dealing with the destruction of rich agricultural land, but are also dealing with human beings whose lives are placed in jeopardy everytime the Little Sioux goes on a rampage.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman. I want to call to the attention of the gentleman that the project which he refers to is also in my congressional district, and I think a good portion of it is in the congressional district of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]. May I add, if the gentleman will bear with me, that the main part of this cut which I want to put into effect, namely $1,500,000 of it will come out of the preliminary surveys which will not have a thing in the world to do with the Little Sioux-Minnesota River project. That project is already authorized and in construction. I will admit that about 20 percent will be the rate of reduction in our particular project which we are both interested in. I do not see that that can do much damage.

Mr. HOEVEN. The gentleman does admit his amendment will slow down the program.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It will slow it down to the extent of 20 percent on the construction end. But may I say to the gentleman, if the Department sees fit it can take most of the survey money and utilize it on the construction, where this money should be used. The Secretary has the right to do that. I do not think, may I say to the gentleman from Iowa, if this amendment is adopted, it will be necessary basically to slow up any of these 11 projects very little, if any.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, for the information of the House I think it is well that I give you more information about the Little Sioux problem than has already been given by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]. The Little Sioux Valley begins in Minnesota about 20 miles above the Iowa-Minnesota line, and extends approximately 100 miles from that point down into the district I have the honor to represent. There is approximately 4,000 square miles in the Little Sioux River Valley. We have had terrific rains and floods there this spring to the extent that in my district right at this minute thou-

sands upon thousands of acres of the finest land that lays outdoors is under water. The part of the Little Sioux River Valley in my district is the lower part of the valley and hence it is the people in my area that suffer most from the floodwaters which inundated the land and will keep that land from being cultivated this year when food is so badly needed. I had a phone call last Friday from a very reputable gentleman of that area who said there were 60,000 acres of land in the Little Sioux Valley in Monona County and Harrison County in my district under water at that time, and that it would be impossible to get that water off of thousands upon thousands of acres of that land in time to put in crops this year. I certainly would be the last one to ask the House to spend money that should not be spent. But I am not at all embarrassed in asking that the full amount in this bill be appropriated for this very necessary purpose. The Congress, with my help, has appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars to apply irrigated water on some of the poorest land that lays outdoors in the Western States and to make that land productive, but, when it comes to the point of keeping water off of the finest land that lays outdoors, it is a different story.

It does not make one from an area such as I represent feel very good after he has been kind to the Western States in appropriating money to place desert land under irrigation, to be refused a small amount, comparatively speaking, to keep the floodwaters off of the finest land that lies outdoors. Of course, the will of the House will prevail, but I do want my colleagues to know the true situation.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. This program keeps the floodwaters off of the good bottom farms of this country, does it not?

Mr. JENSEN. It does.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. How does spending $1,500,000 for unnecessary preliminary surveys and planning, which cannot be used for years to come in actual construction, help keep the water off of your land? You want this money spent in construction, I am sure, in the upper reaches of the streams so that the flow of too much water at one time can be retarded or prevented?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Well, that is what I want. They are, however, using too much money for work other than construction.

Mr. JENSEN. Very well, but survey funds are also necessary for other watersheds.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not know of a man in this House who has fought more for economy than has the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], but I think the gentleman is making the wrong decision here. I know that he has the welfare of the people of his district at heart.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. I have a very good understanding of the matter under discussion. Do I understand that $1,500,000 of this cut is to be taken out of surveys and investigations?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. As far as I am concerned, yes. That is my intention. The record will certainly inform the Department as to where we think this reduction in the main should be applied.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman from Minnesota probably has the very best of intentions along that line, but if he had had that in mind I wonder why his amendment did not read, "No part of which shall be used for preliminary surveys." Then it would have had the effect of actually reducing the expenditure for this purpose, but he just cut the money. I am sure that he meant to have them reduce the funds for surveys, but had he wanted to do that, he should have tied it down in an amendment saying, "No part of which shall be used for such and such."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I will accept an amendment to that effect, if the gentleman will prepare it.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. ANDERSEN, all of us know of your great fight for soil conservation. But there is something else involved here. There are many small tributary valley-wide soil-conservation and flood-control watersheds in this United States that are now receiving attention by the Soil Conservation Service and Army engineers, that being the cheapest way for all the taxpayers to help conserve our soil and to keep our land productive and hence to hold food prices down to a fair level in those watersheds where the farmers have already contoured and terraced and filled gullies, grassed their waterways and done everything they could with their own money to conserve the soil. Now, this survey money which you say is in this bill is to be used to make surveys of that no-man's land between where the Soil Conservation Service can legally operate and where the Army Engineers have authority to operate today. That is along the small streams or tributaries to the main stream. A number of resolutions have been submitted to the Committee on Public Works of this House for watersheds and flood-control surveys. The Honorable CLIFF DAVIS is the chairman of the subcommittee handling that proposed legislation. The facts are that that is the cheapest way to conserve the soil and to stop floods before the floods reach the lowlands and to keep the rain where it falls. That, my colleagues, is not only proper soil conservation but also flood prevention. I would hesitate to put language into this amendment which would deny the Soil Conservation Service, the Army engineers, and the Forest Service permission to make such surveys and investigations as they will make if money is allocated for that purpose. That also is very important. I believe the Members of this House who know something about watershed problems will agree with me that sooner or later we are going to have to treat these small watersheds as individual problems in order finally to get the complete job of soil conservation, flood prevention, and flood control done effectively. Remember that before the Army engineers or the Soil Conservation Service will operate on the streams, the farmers must have contoured and terraced, to a considerable extent, to keep the water out of the streams.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all time for debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto, close in 14 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time for the purpose of registering my opposition not only to the Andersen amendment but to the Kennedy amendment to the Andersen amendment. We in West Virginia are interested in multiple-purpose dams, not in power projects. On two of the projects in my district the Agriculture Department is using money out of these appropriated funds that you are proposing to cut today. They have joined in the State along with the Forestry Department. What we need over in West Virginia, Mr. Chairman, is some trees back on the hillsides that will stop these flash floods which over the last 10 years have drowned from 60 to 70 residents of the State of West Virginia. Only last July 34 people were drowned because our forefathers did not have presence of mind enough to leave some timber on the hillsides. It is true that there will be no actual construction work on projects in West Virginia this year, but there is a whole lot of work that should be done both by the Forestry Department, Department of Agriculture, and the Army engineers in working up these projects. I sincerely hope we will not let our ideas of economy injure so important an appropriation as this.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] is recognized.

[Mr. WILSON of Indiana addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana need have no concern about his soil conservation districts. The gentleman from Minnesota has been as responsible, as

any man has through the past few years, in seeing to it that soil conservation districts as such secure ample appropriations for the new districts created every year. This amendment however has nothing to do with that at all.

I am trying to cure a situation that the investigator from our committee said exists. He reported that this program, referring to the way the flood-control program is being operated, is uneconomical and is stifling the Soil Conservation Service. It is stifling it because other agencies of the department can come in and charge against this program for people it places upon its money that should rightfully be used in the Forest Service and Soil Conservation Service for the actual construction program under flood control.

Is there any good reason in the name of common sense why we should continue making more surveys, to the extent of $1,500,000, than are absolutely necessary? If you will turn to page 760 you will see where the Department asks for $250,000 for general basin investigations. That money, together with the larger portion of the near $1,750,000 asked for to continue preliminary surveys and planning, could much better be devoted to the actual work upstream on projects already authorized by Congress. I am just as much for helping out my particular district as any man in the House, and one of these projects is partially in my district. I personally however do not object to seeing that project slowed down to the extent of 20 percent in construction if necessary so as to give to the Congress the opportunity to fully study this entire set-up.

We are at war and we can afford to slow down on even desirable public works so as to use our men and money in lines more closely akin to the war effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which the gentleman from Minnesota has offered, according to my figures, would cut the works project here about $1,000,000, even though it were applied to surveys. The gentleman from Massachusetts, motivated, I am sure, by the best of intentions, offers to cut the $8,000,000 down to $2,500,000. You know, that is typical of all in these times; we all recognize the absolute need for saving money, and we all can see where we can afford to cut out anything that is across the hill. With all due deference to my good friend from Massachusetts—and I listen to him on matters coming before his Committee on Foreign Affairs—I have a very strong suspicion in my mind that he is not a great expert on the conditions that exist in Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Texas, West Virginia, California, Oklahoma and a number of other States. Now, he is sincere in believing that you can cut those things out in those States and it will not hurt anything, and he is honest about it, but he does not know. That is what we here on this committee do every day. The gentleman from Minnesota read from the report of the investigation. That investigation was made because I asked that it be made. Do you know who put it in the RECORD? I put it in the RECORD. Do you know why I put it in the RECORD? To tell them to correct things that the report showed were bad. First, I had the obligation to try to find out; I had the investigation made and we found out and I had the obligation of putting it in the RECORD to correct it. I had the obligation of recommending to the committee to cut out enough funds to force them to correct it, and we cut this 15 percent. I think I have discharged my responsibility, but I am going to follow it up next year and see that they do. It is not a question of somebody else finding out. We get along fine in our committee. The gentleman from Minnesota and I and the other members of the committee council together. This issue was never raised in the committee; there was not one word said about it. I think that he knows, in all sincerity, that all of us want to do what we can. The gentleman from Iowa was disturbed about the Little Sioux. Under the amendment on the desk you just cut out so much money. There is no way to tell how much of the cut might be applied to the Little Sioux.

There is no duplication here. The people in the Secretary's office that try to coordinate that are under a different appropriation. The Soil Conservation Service does have some of its people assigned to this work. The PMA has some. This is what I think is the best approach to soil conservation. First you go out and make a plan. Then your work projects are required to fit into that plan. That is what I think effective soil conservation should be; that is what it is here. But beyond all that, this is an obligation of the Congress. I pointed out to you that the problems that exist in my area were created by the Congress when you appropriated money to build these dams. In connection with it you gave assurance that attention would be given to this kind of problem. You said the people up above the dams would have to put up 50 percent of the money, but now, under this amendment and the substitute, you say, "Well, we have got the dams in and we flooded you out, but now we are going to welch on carrying out the Government's obligation to put up 50 percent of the cost of relieving the situation which the Government brought about; you would not assist them to open small streams and do the best they can, because the Federal Government stopped up the river down below."

I believe I have a good record for economy in this Congress. I believe I have a good record on this committee. I have investigated every chance I had where I thought there was any chance of doing good. I did it here. We made proper reductions, and we are going to follow up and see that this money goes where it should go.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendments will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. All time on the amendments has expired.

The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITTEN) there were—ayes 100, noes 96.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WHITTEN and Mr. KENNEDY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 110, noes 124.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 129, noes 95.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and I ask unanimous consent to proceed partially out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. WHITTEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, we had an agreement to start with, that we would have to object to any Member speaking out of order. I regret very much to object but this is the third day on this bill, and with the leadership trying to move forward, we must insist on the agreement.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It is my recollection that that agreement was with reference to general debate only. I do not recall that there was any agreement with reference to speaking under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not want to hold the gentleman to any agreement he did not make, and therefore I will not object.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. REED of New York. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not propose to deal with the highway question.

Mr. KEATING. I do, and I shall be glad to proceed in order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order and is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, this is an appropriation bill, and my remarks have to do with the expenditure of public funds.

Mr. Chairman, Hopewell is a quiet, law-abiding community in western New York. When a high-powered car charged through the town at 70 to 75 miles per hour, it was overtaken and stopped by police officers. The driver is reported to have said that he was acting for the President of the United States, that he had the President's sister in the car with him, and that "the President will be distressed if his sister is detained." The police officer, thinking that

this was simply another excuse for speeding, although admittedly a novel and ingenious one, insisted on taking the driver into custody.

He gave his name as Grady A. Stowe and his occupation as a special agent assigned to guard a member of the President's family. He was not able to produce a driver's license. He was sentenced to be fined $20 or imprisoned for 20 days. He paid the fine and departed.

Investigation then developed, to the surprise of the inhabitants of Hopewell and the surrounding countryside, that, sure enough, it was the President's sister traveling around in western New York in a Government-owned limousine together with two Secret Service agents assigned to drive and guard her. It further developed that the accused was from Grand View, Mo., the home town of the President's sister, and apparently a friend of the Truman family who had been placed on the Federal payroll for this ususual assignment.

Justice of the Peace Warren Smithem, of Hopewell, wryly commented at the close of the proceedings in his court that he would probably now receive a letter from the President.

If this violation of law had not taken place, it is questionable whether this newly devised method of squandering the taxpayers' money would have been brought to light. One can understand why it is necessary for the President's immediate family to have protection in the form of a bodyguard. But if this same privilege is to be extended to all the President's collateral relatives, a fair inquiry would be how many there are now receiving this kind of treatment, normally accorded only to visiting dignitaries.

It is reported also that this car was traveling in an easterly direction. If they were on their way from Washington back to Grand View, Mo., they would never have had occasion to travel in anything except a northerly or westerly direction. Also it would seem that, if a guard was necessary, one man ought to be able to do the job.

It is not the dollars and cents involved in this particular incident which constitutes the inherent scandal in the situation. It is the evidence of callous disregard for the legitimate interests of the taxpayers and wage earners who must foot the bill for Government cars, chauffeurs, and bodyguards which is the really serious element in this disclosure.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the gentleman from New York proceeding further on the ground that his remarks have nothing whatever to do with appropriations for the coming fiscal year for the Department of Agriculture but concern some picayune matter which seems to be of interest only to the people of Hopewell, N. Y.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York will proceed in order.

Mr. KEATING. The disclosures to which I have referred are symptomatic of the squandering of the taxpayers' money which we are seeking by the cuts in this bill to eliminate and put a stop to, at least in part. They indicate too that the need to improve the ethical and moral standards with relation to the waste of public funds in the Executive Office of the White House reaches to the highest echelon in that office. Let me hasten, however, to exculpate the President's sister. I understand she is a thoroughly estimable lady of high character. There was no reason for her to question the propriety of a sightseeing trip in a Government car with a driver and companion, all compensated out of the pay envelopes of American workers. Indeed, there was every reason for her to accept that as the norm of conduct for one with deep roots in the White House. The President has been taking everybody else in the country for a ride for 6 years. Why not his own sister?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I insist on a point of order against the gentleman's proceeding. He is out of order and is taking the Committee for a ride by violating the rules of the House.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield.

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman would acquaint himself with the rules of the House, he would know I do not have to ask his permission to address the Chair on a point of order. I further insist on the point of order that the gentleman from New York is not proceeding in order.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York must proceed in order.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has ruled. The gentleman from New York will proceed in order.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the gentleman asked to proceed out of order. There was temporary objection to it, then the objection was withheld, and the agreement is that he can proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is in error. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] objected.

Mr. McCORMACK. A Republican.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for carrying out the provisions of the act of April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f), title III of the act of July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010–1012), and the act of August 11, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 1011 note), including research and investigations into the character, cause, extent, history, and effects of erosion, soil and moisture depletion, and methods of soil and water conservation (including the construction and hydrologic phases of farm irrigation and land drainage, and the construction, operation, and maintenance of experimental watersheds, stations, laboratories, plots, and installations and water regulation to conserve the soil and reduce fire hazards in the Everglades region of Florida, except that expenditures for all work in the Everglades region shall be limited to a sum not in excess of funds made available for such work by the State of Florida, or political subdivisions thereof); making conservation surveys and plans and establishing measures to conserve soil and water (including farm irrigation and land drainage and such special measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs); establishment and operation of conservation nurseries; development and management of land utilization project lands and facilities; dissemination of information; purchase and erection or alteration of permanent buildings; operation and maintenance of aircraft; and furnishing of subsistence to employees; $54,278,000: *Provided*, That the cost of any permanent building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing a water supply or sanitary system and connecting the same to any such building and with the exception of buildings acquired in conjunction with land being purchased for other purposes, shall not exceed $2,500, except for eight buildings to be constructed or improved at a cost not to exceed $15,000 per building and except that alterations or improvements to other existing permanent buildings costing $2,500 or more may be made in any fiscal year in an amount not to exceed $500 per building: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the construction of any such building on land not owned by the Government: *Provided further*, That in the State of Missouri, where the State has established a central State agency authorized to enter into agreements with the United States or any of its agencies on policies and general programs for the saving of its soil by the extension of Federal aid to any soil conservation district in such State, the agreements made by or on behalf of the United States with any such soil conservation district shall have the prior approval of such central State agency before they shall become effective as to such district: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation may be expended for soil and water conservation operations under the act of April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f), in demonstration projects: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $5,000 may be used for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further*, That not to exceed $265,000 of funds authorized for fiscal year 1951 for development of land utilization projects may remain available until expended.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HORAN: On page 30, line 22, after the period insert a new proviso, as follows: "*Provided further*, That qualified local engineers may be temporarily employed at per diem rates to perform the technical planning work of the service."

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered in an attempt to make it possible for the work of the soil-conservation districts to proceed with more speed.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Personally I have no objection to the amendment. I cannot speak for the committee, however.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I know there are quite a number of Members who are interested in the point I am bringing up now. I want to impress upon the Committee the fact that we have shown here a great interest in all types

of soil conservation from the watershed, the very crests of our great mountains, down to the deltas of our rivers. We are interested in that and we are urging that more soil-conservation districts be formed. We are appropriating more and more money each year for this purpose. Today the total number of soil-conservation districts in the United States is somewhere in the neighborhood of 2,300 or more. That is a round figure and approximately right.

Keep in mind that if the intent of this body continues, and I hope it does, it will result in a final figure in 1970 or 1975, when we have reached the acme of this program that we want, of 15,000 people working in the Soil Conservation Service. I do not quarrel with that because we are asking for it, but I certainly would do everything in my power to provide for per diem or non-civil-service people who can qualify for this great work, a lot of which lies ahead of us. That is the intent of this amendment which I understand has been accepted by the chairman.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman has offered a very good amendment and I hope it will be adopted. I wonder if at the present time they have that authority?

Mr. HORAN. No.

Mr. GATHINGS. The authority to hire these civil engineers?

Mr. HORAN. No. We had a lot of trouble with that very item. This amendment will put them right on the spot as to whether or not they will do it. They have not been doing it and we have had protests from qualified civil engineers in some districts in which they have had difficulty getting technical service. The intent of the amendment is to bring out in the open that very point.

Mr. GATHINGS. I have prepared an amendment that would utilize the services, when practicable, of private civil engineers in connection with the conservation and use of agricultural land resources program. I trust that your amendment will attain that objective, if so it will not be necessary for me to present mine.

Mr. HORAN. They have that power now; the transfer of 5 percent of the conservation and use funds for the Soil Conservation Service work.

Mr. GATHINGS. Since the consolidation of the Soil Conservation Service offices with the Production and Marketing Administration local offices I have received complaints that private accredited civil engineers in counties that are not in soil conservation districts have been deprived of laying off the farms and doing this technical engineering work that they had formerly done. I hope that the gentleman's amendment will keep these engineers in business. They should not have to apply to the Government for a job.

Mr. HORAN. They have that power already, although it is on a voluntary basis.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I can see where the effect of this amendment will be for economy. This will be temporary help?

Mr. HORAN. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. Instead of the Department hiring people on a yearly basis, then having the possibility that many of them will lay around in the off-peak period, they will simply be permitted under the gentleman's amendment to hire technical assistants when needed?

Mr. HORAN. That is exactly right.

Mr. JENSEN. Then they will be removed from the rolls when not needed?

Mr. HORAN. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q), including not to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; $256,500,000, to remain available until December 31 of the next succeeding fiscal year for compliance with the program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conserving practices authorized under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1951, carried out during the period July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1951, inclusive: *Provided,* That not to exceed $25,250,000 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such program, the cost of aerial photographs, however, not to be charged to such limitation; but not more than $4,966,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further,* That payments to claimants hereunder may be made upon the certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the conservation practice or practices and has complied with all other requirements as conditions for such payments and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of title 18, United States Code: *Provided further,* That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive order No. 9069, of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information at the county level to individual farmers: *Provided further,* That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1952 program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conserving practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended (amounting to $225,000,000, including administration, and formulated on the basis of a distribution of the funds available for payments and grants among the several States in accordance with their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary, except that the proportion allocated to any State shall not be reduced more than 15 percent from the distribution for the next preceding program year, and no participant shall receive more than $2,500); but the payments or grants under such programs shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State committees appointed pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590h (b)), for the respective States: *Provided further,* That not to exceed 5 percent of the allocation for the agricultural conservation program for any county may be allotted with the approval of the State committee to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program and the funds so allotted shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such county: *Provided further,* That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary under programs provided for herein: *Provided further,* That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department, shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of title 18, United States Code, section 1913, to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 33, line 4, strike out "$225,000,000," and insert "$150,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment on page 33, line 4, to reduce the $225,000,000 figure to $150,000,000. This proposal is designed to reduce the amount of allotments to be made under the act of February 29, 1936, as amended. It has the endorsement of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and all of you have received a telegram from Mr. Allan B. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which I will read. It is dated the 10th:

Reduction Federal expenditures absolutely essential part sound inflation-control program. Unless we control inflation, we jeopardize the freedom of all citizens, farmers included. Therefore, farmers willing to do their share toward accomplishing this objective. Specifically urge your support the amendment agricultural appropriation bill

to reduce agricultural conservation program funds for 1952 crop year to $150,000,000.

ALLAN B. KLINE,
President,
American Farm Bureau Federation.

This matter is in somewhat the following situation: These funds have been spent or supposed to be spent for different items that have been handed to the farmers to use on their farms: Inorganic fertilizer to the tune of 50 percent; protective green manure crops, 15 percent; erosion-control practices, 15 percent; range and pasture improvement, 15 percent; and other items, 5 percent. The figure last year was $285,000,000 and the budget submitted that figure to go in the bill for this year and the committee cut it to $225,000,000.

The Farm Bureau at its meeting discussed this situation and they said this:

With respect to our recommendation of $150,000,000 for the 1952 program, we reiterate our previous position that these funds be apportioned on the basis of need.

The encouragement of better farming practices which this program has fostered has been a sound public investment. Many of these practices have become interwoven into farming operations to the extent that many farmers will follow them because they are good business. In other words, the educational and demonstrational aspects of the program have served their purpose. The existence of a firm demand for the greatest production of grain, fiber, and livestock products which can be turned out is an added reason for reducing these funds.

Then they quote their resolution.

That is a part of the situation. I have been up against that situation in my own territory many times. I have had many farmers come to see me about it. This is what has happened. Several hundred pounds of fertilizer would be dumped in the corner of a lot, and the farmer on whose land it was dumped would not even know it was there. At other times they have brought in fertilizer that was not suitable for the land in question, and left it with the farmers. Many times they have brought in lime where the soil was underlaid with limestone, and it would be absolutely useless to try to put lime on it with any desirable effect.

Mr. Chairman, we are right in this situation, a pretty serious situation. The Committee on Ways and Means is holding continuous sessions trying to find ways to raise money to pay the 1952 expenditure bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Every day you read of some group on whom they have increased taxes. Is it not about time that we take things in hand and undertake to reduce expenditures as far as it is possible, so that our budget can be balanced and we will not have to pay our debts with further inflated dollars? It seems to me it is about time we wake up to our responsibilities and meet them face to face. I know there will be farmers who will want to have this money handed to them, but this is not a soil conservation program. That is the item that was covered from page 28 to the middle of page 31. This is a program where we turn over money to the farmer to use on his own soil if he uses it.

I believe any friend of the farmer can come to realize that unless we do away with these things that are costing money and are for the benefit of individual farmers and for the benefit of farmers as a class, outside of such advisory programs as the Soil Conservation Service and such things as agricultural research, we are really doing them a disservice. The longer we carry on with those things and the more money we spend that way, the more we make the farmer subject to being a target of other folks.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman will be interested to know that a few weeks ago the leading farm paper in Nebraska made a check with the farmers in our State and asked them whether payments for certain soil conservation practices that benefit the farmer should be omitted from the President's budget. The farmers voted 72 percent in favor of omitting those benefits.

Mr. TABER. That is the situation with the best of the farmers. The lights in the chamber went out temporarily just a moment ago. The lights will go out for good if we do not begin to save money. Let us start now with an intelligent approach to this problem.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARSHALL as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 33, line 4, strike out "$225,000,000" and insert "$285,000,000."

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Is this the item where the cranberry bog owners were paid to sand in their bogs?

Mr. MARSHALL. That is a part of this particular program.

Mr. Chairman, one of the greatest problems we have and which will ever face this country is the production of food, fiber, and oil which is needed. That is a huge problem. One of the greatest problems that our forefathers had when they came to this country was the conservation of our natural resources. The pages of history are filled with examples of how Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, and Patrick Henry carried on soil-conservation programs. Patrick Henry said something to the effect that no man is a greater patriot than he who conserves his soil. They began that kind of work to conserve their soil. But in our greed to get the wealth out of the soil we have depleted our natural resources. We have depleted our timber supplies and depleted our soil. It is very questionable if any nation in the world has ever depleted its soil as rapidly as the United States has. Unless we do something to sustain the soil and to build up the resources that we have in this country we can very soon sink to the status of a third-rate power. All my amendment intends to do is to carry on a soil-conservation program for which the Congress originally authorized $500,000,000, on the same basis that it has heretofore been carried on. The psychological effect at this time would be very bad if we were to say that we do not need food and fiber and oil in this critical period. We made that mistake in World War I. We did not pay proper attention to the conservation of our soil, and because we did not we went into a stage in our history, which is a sad chapter to look back on. The Dust Bowl grew out of the lack of proper conservation of our soil.

We have people in a number of Federal agencies who are interested in soil conservation. The Soil Conservation Service, which we just considered, has been doing a remarkable job. The Forest Service has been doing a remarkable job. But over and above that the Production and Marketing Administration, with its agricultural conservation program, has done an outstanding job. One of the reasons it has been doing an outstanding job is that it can reach every farm family in the United States. Five and three-quarter million farms have an opportunity to carry on soil-conservation practices under this program. With an excellent job of planning this year and with the greatest of optimism, the Soil Conservation Service program will reach about 900,000 farms since its inception. This program year in and year out will reach and hence give opportunity to every farmer to comply with it. It is true enough that a leading farm organization, the National Farm Bureau Federation, of which I am a member and of which I am proud to be a member, has come out recommending that we spend $150,000,000 for soil conservation for the next fiscal year. That spirit and that intent of the National Farm Bureau does not indicate what the Farm Bureau units in my district think.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. Last year the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation came out against the cotton bill. He made a mistake there, because we are in dire need of more cotton right now. Yet, he said the cotton bill 2 years ago was too liberal. I wonder what he will say on his fighting the cotton bill at this time.

Mr. MARSHALL. That indicates that it is possible for a human being to be in error. I think he is very much in error in this instance. I read his report before the Committee on Appropriations. His statement asking for a cut in this worth-while appropriation is not justified by his statement.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman referred to the Farm Bureau Federation. I wonder whether the gentleman is aware of the division in the Farm Bureau Federation Board itself.

Mr. MARSHALL. I understand it was very close.

Mr. HARDY. My information is the vote was 9 to 11.

Mr. MARSHALL. I thank the gentleman. I am interested in his statement because I understand that the great Senator from the gentleman's State, Senator BYRD, has advocated that we have at least $300,000,000 appropriation in order to carry on the proper conservation work.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. I wonder whether the gentleman has any information to indicate whether or not this action on the part of the American Farm Bureau Federation may have a background of this internal fight in agriculture between Extension and the AAA, and whether this might be based on prejudice rather than on national interest.

Mr. MARSHALL. It is certainly not based on a knowledge of farm conditions. In every community of our country we see farms abandoned because proper soil-conservation programs are not carried out on those particular farms.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. Is it not true that Mr. Klein and a portion of the Farm Bureau Federation has for the last several years been attempting to get all of the soil-conservation functions under the Extension Service, and do you not think that this is really an underhanded way of trying to accomplish what they have been unable to accomplish otherwise?

Mr. MARSHALL. I know the Secretary of Agriculture has been doing an outstanding job in attempting to get organizations interested in soil conservation to work together. This Congress is interested in avoiding duplication of the various agencies engaged in soil conservation. The Secretary of Agriculture has made great strides in that direction. I hope that we will all give him an opportunity to make his program work. I would not know what is in the mind of Mr. Klein. I am talking today in terms of things which affect my farm neighbors. Every time we have a farm which goes to pieces because of improper maintenance of fertility, that farm becomes a burden upon the community, upon the county, and the State. Every one of us can go out into our districts now and see farms which have been abandoned on account of failure to maintain fertility. This program that we are talking about now of providing for $285,000,000 to carry on the soil conservation program to the extent it has been carried on will not provide sufficient funds to completely do the job. It will provide funds to carry on the program to the extent it has been carried on during the last year. That is highly important at this time, because we are asking our farmers to produce, as they have never had to produce before, the food and fiber that is needed. We are calling attention to the fact that we must safeguard our soil resources. We must carry out a crop rotation program. We must carry on the seeding of legume crops to protect the soil. We must provide for green manure crops, for the application of phosphate. We must provide for lime that is so badly needed to protect our soil and our land and our grasses.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. What effect would the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] have should it be adopted?

Mr. MARSHALL. It appears to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] would completely sabotage the program and would cut down the payments to such an extent that after allowances for administrative work which it would be absolutely necessary to maintain there would not be adequate money left to carry on these practices so necessary for proper conservation of the soil.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. The thing that we want to emphasize is that this is no handout to the farmers. The farmers contribute more than 50 percent of their funds besides their labor to carry on these practices. We are doing it in a democratic way, not in an autocratic way; it is not regimentation. The older countries say to the farmers or to their peasants, if you will, "You must do so and so." We do not do that in this country; we say to them that if they will carry out these worth-while practices that are intended to maintain soil fertility we will cooperate with them and give them part of the funds with which to do it. Just think what a wonderful thing that is in a country like this—to carry out principles of soil conservation in that matter. Just think what wonderful things have been done by this program and will continue to be done by this program, the building up of our water resources, the building up of soil fertility, the preservation of our greatest resource, the land; all those things which affect the future wealth and welfare of our country.

It will be entirely false economy to cut this appropriation at this time, because every dollar spent on this program renders a return of nine or ten times. We are going to need to sustain and maintain our economy in the very best manner we know how. It would be a very poor bargain to do away with soil conservation and let our soil be depleted. That is very poor economy, because we need every acre of it that we have; every particle of that soil to provide fine food and fiber to maintain the economy of our people now and for future generations.

WHY AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM APPROPRIATIONS SHOULD NOT BE CUT

The United States cannot measure the strength of its agriculture on its capacity to satisfy only home needs for grain, cotton, and other farm products. For this purpose, our lands and farmers are more than adequate. Since 1939, United States agriculture has been shouldering increasing responsibilities reaching far beyond our shores and we need to consider carefully whether farming is strong enough when measured against these world responsibilities. The United States farm program is now a world program and our allies and many other nations await with great anxiety the determination of our food policies.

During the past decade, the role of United States agriculture as a member of the Nation's defense team has been greatly expanded. During and following World War II, United States farms provided the chief guaranty of food security for ourselves and our allies. The urgency of the present world situation on the food front demands that our agriculture be made strong enough to meet any emergencies that may arise. These demands require greater not less effort to increase and strengthen the production capacity of our farms—a production capacity which must be measured against the requirements of emergencies which may dwarf all past emergencies in intensity of demand on our agricultural resources.

The agricultural conservation program has and continues to bring about, a steady increase in the productive capacity of American farms. A high demand for food without equally vigorous programs to protect and improve our fertility reserves and expand the future productive capacity of agriculture involves risks our Nation can scarcely afford.

Periods of high production are periods of heavy drain on our soil, water, ranges and woodland resources. In such periods unless adequate programs are kept in force deterioration of our resources sets in unless labor, equipment, essential materials and supplies needed for sustained high production are provided and made readily available. Erosion and loss of fertility are a constant threat to food security. When conservation is slowed down the forces that tear down our agricultural resources speed up.

The cost of the agricultural conservation program is not great, in fact, it is small compared to the benefits. An appropriation of $285,000,000 amounts to $1.82 per person in the United States and its insular possessions. The proposed authorization of $225,000,000 would be $1.44 per person or a difference of 38 cents per person.

A food insurance policy at a cost of $1.82 is cheap indeed. A saving of 38 cents would be expensive economy right now and a gamble on food production we as a Nation cannot afford to take.

The $60,000,000 difference means much more than $60,000,000 less soil-conservation and soil-building practices applied to the land. Farmers more than match the Government contribution and throw in their labor for good measure.

One of the most remarkable things about the agricultural conservation program is that it gets soil-building measures carried out far in excess of that expected from the payments made. The effectiveness of the Government assistance in getting measures applied to the land in increasing volume and thereby strengthening the productive capacity of our farms has been clearly demonstrated.

Great strides have been made. In 1936 the use of limestone under the program was 3,600,000 tons. In 1949, 24,400,000 tons were used; however, it is estimated that 78,900,000 tons should be used annually. The story is similar for phosphate. The acreage of cover and green manure crops has increased from 5,900,000 acres in 1936 to over 17,000,000 acres in 1949. Before the program started, dust storms were becoming increasingly severe. Stripcropping, an effective wind-erosion control measure, was practiced on 6,800,000 acres in 1949. The acreage of land terraced under the program totals 16,900,000.

Little had been done about the western range prior to 1936. It was in bad shape. Stockwater and other facilities to obtain proper stock distribution and better range management are being provided for under the program but are still inadequate. Fifty-eight thousand stockwater reservoirs were built in 1949; however, over one million remain to be built. In the principal livestock-producing areas, pasture and range seedings of grasses and legumes are important to conserve soil and feed livestock. In 1949 over 5,000,000 acres were seeded under the program. This is more than double the acreage seeded in 1936. The increasing productive capacity of all our farm and ranch lands are our insurance of abundant food now and in the future.

The effect of incentive payments under the program is amply demonstrated in the following table which shows just a few practices. In 1948 the ACP authorization was cut to $150,000,000 from $300,000,000 in the previous year, 1947. The extent of practices carried out fell off sharply. In 1949, when funds authorized totaled $262,000,000 for the agricultural conservation program, substantial recovery was made in the extent of practices applied, but it will be noted that the recovery was slower for permanent-type practices. This is to be expected as contractors become scattered or get on to other work, equipment is dispersed, and farmers hesitate to go ahead in memory of the previous years' programs.

Practice	Unit	1947	1948	1949
Dams to conserve water for irrigation or livestock or to control erosion.	Number	118,096	65,028	99,368
Drainage	Acres	5,595,076	3,290,880	3,718,559
Pasture and range seeding	do	5,238,232	3,538,076	5,035,975
Liming materials	Tons	29,285,677	22,284,542	24,433,957
Green manure and cover crops	Acres	18,617,621	13,914,487	17,379,703
Terracing	do	1,592,634	1,253,337	1,566,098
Farms participating		2,729,794	2,296,056	2,586,791
Individual practices carried out		5,881,647	4,396,756	5,494,622

The picture is similar for other practices, irrigation and water conservation, erosion control, drainage and the rest. Farmers just cannot carry out conservation measures if they don't have the money. The costs of carrying out conservation measures are up; supplies, materials and labor also cost more. When a farmer has to choose between spending his money for daily necessities or conservation, the conservation loses out even though he knows that the conservation practices will repay their costs in future years. Many practices repay their costs only over a long period. Some even reduce income as compared with exploitation of the soil. Some practices do not increase production at all. They do prevent its reduction by protecting the soil. Many practices are of more value to other land downstream than to the land on which performed. In general, the permanent and semipermanent practices are of a type that repay their costs only over a long time.

Great strides have been made but much remains to be done. It is estimated that five times the $285,000,000 I am asking for is needed annually to do the job.

Our agricultural responsibilities may be briefly reviewed.

Food and our growing population: We have a much larger population here at home to be fed than ever before and it is growing larger at the rate of about 2,000,000 each year. Our present population is over 150,000,000 and may number 170,000,000 by 1960. We must prepare ourselves to feed them diets that will keep the Nation strong.

Food and the ever-normal granary: The ever-normal granary was established in the thirties to cope with weather contingencies. We needed reserves to tide us over another emergency drought period.

Not drought, but war, emptied the granary and it was emptied despite phenomenally good weather. During the past decade, we have twice seen what seemed to be over abundant supplies of wheat, corn, cotton and other farm products rapidly disappear. Our own population growth and our international responsibilities leaves no doubt that we will need a much larger granary in the future.

Our farms must fill and maintain this more commodious granary. At the same time, they must fully meet the current requirements for food, feed and fiber.

Food and fertility reserves: Storage reserves, no matter how big we make them, are good for emergencies only. They cannot possibly be big enough for the long pull. We must place our dependence for food security on greatly expanding the productivity of our farms by increasing fertility reserves in our soils.

We have in the present situation, a far greater urgency for the creation of fertility reserves than ever existed before. Objectives must now go far beyond making up for our exploitative errors of the past and set out to create fertility reserves that will insure fruits, vegetables, grains, fibers, meat, milk, and eggs in such abundance as to fully meet the needs of our people and supply a lot for others.

Food and reconstruction: Immediate postwar years are usually those when food demands are at their peak and production the lowest. Reconstruction periods, therefore, begin with many people in war-torn countries desperately seeking food. These are years also when vanquished peoples are reconstructing their governments and seeking guidance and political principles to follow.

Food and friendship are potent answers to Communist oratory and discipline. Food helped mightily to stop communism in Western Europe; however, the margin was too close for comfort but the fact remains that we won because we could deliver food as well as oratory.

The next reconstruction period will enable United States food, if the country is prepared to supply it, to be an enormous boon to suffering humanity and a most potent political weapon. Perhaps nothing could argue so well as the fundamental strength and decency of our democracy as could the fact of its having made provision to feed a hungry world when food was most needed. In fact, at no other point, is the argument for creation of great fertility reserves in our soils quite so eloquent as this relating to reconstruction period food supplies.

Food and the financial health and vigor of agriculture: The financial health and vigor of agriculture is a necessary condition for the continued upward progress in the further development and expansion of our agricultural resources. The parity concept of price support combined with orderly marketing and production through the operations of the commodity loan and allotment programs have contributed greatly in making it possible for agriculture to gain and maintain a healthy financial condition.

The agricultural conservation program gives the needed incentive and directive force and constant vigilance necessary to assure steady improvement and protection of our food supplies for the future.

These programs were well conceived and helped create a favorable economic environment for United States agriculture. Indeed, the improved financial

condition of agriculture since the inception of these programs, has been the greatest single factor in accounting for the rapid progress made in conservation farming and the phenomenal production records our farmers have made during the past decade.

I do not propose to weaken these proven programs when there is such an urgent necessity to build up the fertility reserves in our soils at a much faster rate than has heretofore been necessary. The urgency of the present international situation and our tremendous responsibilities of our Nation adds force to the view that greater, not less, effort needs to be directed toward strengthening the productive capacity of our farms.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to arguments here for several days and I am convinced we have before us three fallacies.

Just before we rose last Thursday the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY] had spoken persuasively on the subject of the value of the dollar. He made the statement that there had been a change in the dollar. The gentleman was absolutely right. The fallacy is that we think we are dealing with the same kind of dollar.

The 1900 dollar is worth 31 cents today; the 1939 dollar is worth 46 cents today. If you want a very visual demonstration, it would take this $2 bill to buy what this $1 bill bought 12 years ago.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I have but a moment and I have three points I wish to make.

The second fallacy, is one for which I will use as an illustration the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota. I will vote against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] and I will vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. Somehow we have been sold the idea that these expenditures can only be made if the Federal Government makes them, that these things will not be done unless the Federal Government does them, that nobody can spend money unless the Federal Government spends it, and that money cannot be secured anywhere nor work done except by the Federal Government. That fallacy has arrived in the 18 years in the increased centralization of the Federal Government.

The gentleman from Minnesota, when he thinks about it, will agree with me that many of these things will continue to be done by all good farmers. When he talks about phosphates or fertilizers he knows we are putting fertilizer on our land because it increases production, therefore we are going to get more in the way of crops. When he talks about cover crops, he knows a good farmer puts cover crops on his land, as I have done, and many of you have done, because it increases the productiveness of the land. These things will be done.

Many of the things we are talking about in the appropriation bills will be done cheaper, better, more efficiently, by the States or by the local agencies or by the farmers in this case, by the people themselves.

The third fallacy I touch upon only briefly in the time remaining. This is the fallacy that we are in a normal time. We are not in a normal time. We are in a third world war. The Congress just 2 days ago by its action on the Veterans' Hospitalization Act declared that we were in a third world war and created the veterans of the third world war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that if we are in an emergency, we should declare by our votes upon this floor that we are going to distribute these responsibilities. We are going to ask the States to carry some, we are going to ask the citizens to carry some; we are not going to continue the centralization of expenditures and the centralization of power as we have in the past and this, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, would be an excellent place to start. I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. I want to inform the distinguished gentleman that every practice that these funds help is done by the farmers themselves, as I am sure the gentleman realizes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes, and more often at their own expense.

Mr. MARSHALL. Unless these practices are encouraged by the Federal Government they will drop off. And also I would like to inform the gentleman that during this time, and I am sure the gentleman agrees with me, the farmers are going to be asked to carry a tremendous portion of our production load and that they will do the best they can.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am sure they will and many of the farmers are strongly supporting this amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], in sort of a dramatic way, took some bills out of his pocket. He first showed us a one dollar bill and then a bill of a higher denomination and referred to one as a New Deal bill. Yes; I remember 1930, 1931, and 1932 when we had the raw deal bill. Those were the "raw bill" deal days; those were the days when the American people were sold down the river through lack of unthinking leadership under the Republican Party and under former President Hoover. Those were the days when cotton was selling for 6 cents a pound, when wheat was selling for 25 cents a bushel, when corn was selling for about the same, and when oil was selling for 25 cents a barrel; yes, when 12 to 15 million people were unemployed, and behind them were millions of others dependent upon them, their wives and their children. So, when in his Republican-minded way my friend from California talked about the New Deal dollar, he honors the Democratic Party, because it was the leadership of the Democratic Party that took the country out of the economic nose dive it had taken and brought it back so that today instead of a $39,000,000,000 national income in 1932, last year we had a national income of $270,000,000,000, and the national income this year will be higher.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us refer briefly to the amendment offered by my friend from New York [Mr. TABER], who made a sincere argument in support of his amendment, for whom I have profound respect. I come from a district that has not got one farm in it, but I know the value of agriculture to our national life. I know, studying history, that many great nations of the past that were great agricultural nations, became deserts when they forgot the topsoil. That four to six inches or more that is the topsoil of a nation, and which is the productive part in connection with agriculture, is vital in the life of a nation. I wonder how many realize the value of the fertile topsoil to a nation. Four to six inches deep, yes, but take that away, thin it away, then the nation commences to go down and down. The strength of our Nation lies in our industry, but without agriculture we would be dependent. I am glad that we are not only a powerful industrial Nation, but I am very glad that we are a powerful agriculture nation. God has been good to us, and we have to keep that topsoil fertile; we have to keep it productive. I am speaking of one who realizes, from my study of history, what has happened to great agricultural nations of the past. Take many deserts that exist in the world of today. Yes, at one time they, too, were productive areas. Other areas of the world, great nations of the past, have come and gone, and invariably you find, as you study history, that one of the main causes has been their failure to conserve the topsoil of their land, the failure to assist agriculture in preserving its strength, in preserving its dignity, and in preserving its soil productive capacity. So, we in America, in appropriating money through the Congress of the United States for purposes of this kind, are not only making a sound investment in connection with our country as a whole, but in connection with our national defense. We are making a very important investment, because a country in these modern times, particularly with a powerful and active agriculture, is all the stronger from the angle of national defense because of it. And I am surprised to see my Republican friends offering an amendment to reduce the amount included in this bill by the committee from $225,000,000 to $150,000,000. We Democrats recognize the value of the topsoil. I hope the majority of the Republicans will join with us in defeating the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on what I conceive to be the thought of the subcommittee that has had this matter under consideration. You may not agree with us, but I think it only fair for me to come down here in the well and review the work of this subcommittee through the years, because our able chairman and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and I have served for some 6 years or more on this subcommittee which annually considers this item.

Let us once and for all give up the idea that these soil-conservation payments are anything in the nature of an addition to the income of the farmer, at a time when, to keep his place in this inflationary national income of ours, he must have in the neighborhood of $40,000,000,000 a year. Certainly, in that light, this appropriation does not amount to much, so let us forget that.

Let us get on to the bill, and perhaps I might reflect the two attitudes that have obtained in our committee and the reason for what you find in the bill now. You find in this bill an appropriation of two hundred and fifty-six million-odd dollars for commitments which we made in last year's bill. Then on page 33, and that is what the amendments are addressed to, you find various amendments offered against the commitment for our next crop year, that your committee thought was fair in the light of the information that had come to us and the various ways that we as a subcommittee reacted to the various pressures and arguments both pro and con on this item.

We arrived, I think, quite generally on the figures that are in the bill by give and take. We are here today defending our action. It is not anything that we did arbitrarily, because we have lived with this item. We can cut it or we can raise it, but I feel that our judgment was such that it should remain where it is.

Our chairman has been most eloquent in the past in pointing out that this is not really an appropriation that goes to individual farmers but is a protection against erosion and the loss of valuable topsoil, and a security and assurance that we are going to have crops each succeeding year. Our ranking Republican on this committee has been most eloquent also in pointing out the good work, in addition to this type of thing, that our local committees do.

Bear in mind that none of the amendments nor the commitment does anything in the direction of lowering or adjusting or modifying the twenty-five and a quarter million dollars that is in this bill and is involved in the commitment for next year that will go for local administration, the paying of your county committees.

I make this explanation because I feel it only fair that you have the advantage of our committee work.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, before commenting on the pending amendment I want to express the appreciation of those of us who come from agricultural sections of the United States to our distinguished majority leader, who historically has stood in the well of this House and defended agricultural legislation and agricultural appropriation bills. He comes from a city; nevertheless, he has been a loyal friend of agriculture. I can say that he has that same broad attitude about other segments of our economy. It is a thing that makes him one of the great majority leaders of all times, in my opinion.

The amendment of the gentleman from New York is designed to do one thing. It is the beginning of a step to kill this conservation program. I am just as confident as I can be that if it were in the power of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] today to take his pen and write off this program for good, the gentleman would not waste much time in doing it. This program originated under a Democratic administration. It has been one of the things that has made the Democratic Party strong in the agricultural sections of our country. The Democratic Party has historically sponsored legislation favorable to the farmers of the Nation. I know there are Members on the Republican side today who are not going to support this amendment and who realize the importance of this program to their sections. In the brief time I have I would like to point out to the committee that we are all concerned with our production and in how much we can increase our potential for production in this great hour of crisis.

We are allowing industry to charge off expansion costs within a period of 5 years and to depreciate capital investments in that short length of time. We are actually lending money to steel companies and machine-tool companies at practically no cost or with a very low rate of interest in order to bring about greater production. The agricultural-production effort is just as important to our war effort as our industrial effort is. So it seems to me to be penny-wise and pound-foolish to strike at one of the most important parts of our total mobilization program. Do you mean to tell me this is not an important program? I have seen it work in my section of the United States. It has brought about a total change in the type of farming that we used to engage in. This very soil-conservation program has revised and revamped our entire agricultural system in my section of the country. Today—not because of inflation, but because of this soil-conservation work, land is worth twice as much in my section of the country as it would be worth if it had not been for this very program. It has worked. It is a good investment. It is not a give-away program. It is not a subsidy. We do not back off on subsidies for shipping and for aviation and other industries. This is not an actual subsidy. It is a capital investment in America.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. And the land produces twice as much as it did 15 years ago, does it not?

Mr. PRESTON. That is correct. That is the purpose of the program. The land produces more when you follow these soil-conservation practices. So I say to my friends on the right, from the city districts, I beseech you to follow the good example set by our majority leader. Let us not have a coalition in reverse on this amendment. Stand with your farmer friends and let us defeat this amendment and preserve this important plank in the program of the Democratic Party.

(Mr. PHILLIPS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Taber amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that at this time I cannot agree to the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL]. If we were not at war, I would vote for his substitute. As the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] has well pointed out, we on the subcommittee first took into consideration the point of how much money was spent under this program in the last crop year. We found that that sum was two-hundred-and-fifty-six-odd million dollars. Last year, if you will recall, the Congress set the figure at $285,000,000 for the program. The President saw fit—and when I say "the President," I mean the administration—to impound last fall, as part of his $550,000,000 savings, approximately $28,000,000 which was in this particular fund and which normally would have been used to carry over into this crop year as a sort of revolving fund for the purchase of soil-conservation materials.

I think the position of the subcommittee should be upheld, because, after all, this is what we have done: First $285,000,000 was last year ordered by the Congress for this year's program. Only $256,000,000 was spent. We have taken this $256,000,000 figure which was the cost of the program for both this year and last year and we have simply cut it about 11 percent, about the same amount that was cut generally throughout the Department of Agriculture bill. We felt that this program, regardless of how much we think of it, should also take its proportionate cut. So we have placed in the bill for next year the sum of $225,000,000, and I do think that amount will give us a very good and effective program, allowing for the fact that we must save money for the war effort.

I am glad to see that this House has not tried to amend or question the actual $256,000,000 appropriation in this particular bill for this program. By putting that in there we showed faith with the farmers. We promised them last year a certain program. We are simply giving to them that particular amount of money, although, as I stated before, the budget did impound the normal carry-over on this particular program amounting to $28,000,000. We have also provid-

ed ample money for the proper operation of our PMA and committees right down to the township level. These committee organizations are the very heart of all of our price support programs. I have fought for ample money for them ever since coming to Congress.

I might say again about the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], that if things were not as tough financially as they are I would today vote for his amendment. In normal times we must have about a $300,000,000 program if we are to hope to leave our soil to our children in more fertile condition than we found it.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. The gentleman was talking about what the farmers had been promised. What were they promised for this program this year?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Exactly what we have in the bill. All commitments under the announced $285,000,000 program are being taken care of.

Mr. TACKETT. I understood they were promised $285,000,000.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The $285,000,000 was the base for this year's program. It has not all been expended, as far as I know.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. Of course, I want to add to what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] has said, that we announced last year a $285,000,000 program. What we do in the spring is to state the amount the Government will contribute if the works are done. How much you actually owe at the end of the year depends on how much of the work has been carried out by the farmers. It was believed that the amount in the bill would be sufficient to pay our obligation to the extent it had been carried out by the farmers.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTEN. We did provide that under the basic law, if it did not cover the amount of work done, the Government would carry out its full amount to the extent of the $285,000,000.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We have provision, as the gentleman has said, that, if it does require more funds than we have put in the bill, this fund will be made available. Any commitments made by our Government should be honored.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. The gentleman knows as well as I do, because I have heard him repeatedly make remarks on the floor of this House, the cost of production which the farmer has to contend with. Therefore, during this time we need to think in terms not only of right now but of future generations, as a time when an additional incentive is needed to carry on soil conservation practices. In a short-sighted way, because of lack of information, we are in danger of failing to carry out the things that we all know we should carry out in connection with good soil conservation practice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I may say to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] that what we have done in the bill in proposing a $225,000,000 program for 1952 is about halfway between the viewpoint of the American Farm Bureau Federation and the Farmers Union. Personally, I am a member of the Farm Bureau, and here is my card for 1951. I have been a member, probably, for more years than Mr. Kline. I do not agree with his contention that we should cut this program down to $150,000,000, any more than I can agree to the contention of my friend, Mr. Christensen, head of the Farmers Union of Minnesota, who wired me today to support the Marshall amendment for $282,500,000. I think if we go between those figures, about $225,000,000, as we have placed in the bill, we will have as good a program as we can in good conscience ask the Congress to approve, considering the straits we are in today.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman has made the statement that we should give the President credit for impounding the $28,000,000.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. You understand that I also gave to the Democratic administration credit for helping this soil conservation program through these years. I also want the President to take the credit or blame, as you may look at it, for impounding that $28,000,000 last fall. In effect he cut the $285,000,000 program down to the $258,000,000 program we here give funds for.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is why I want to straighten the gentleman out. The gentleman, as I know, voted for the Taber-Thomas amendment a year ago, when the over-all bill was up before us. The reason for the impounding of that money was the action of the Congress itself and by the vote of the gentleman from Minnesota and practically everybody on that side; you voted for the Taber-Thomas amendment, and when it came back from the Senate we abdicated our authority and gave our authority down to that place on Pennsylvania Avenue about which the gentleman has been hollering for the last 15 years.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Certainly I voted for the Thomas-Taber amendment last year, and I would do so again. But never will I vote, and never have I voted, to give to the President the power to cut our appropriations. It is our job, I may say to the gentleman from Rhode Island, here on the floor of the House to do as we wish, and should do with these appropriations; it is not up to us to give our authority to the administration.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is exactly what the gentleman did a year ago, and he knows it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Not with my approval.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise largely to ask one question: Does any member of this committee know of any nation in the world, any nation anywhere, any civilized nation, that is wasting its soil like the United States is?

I think that is a question for us to ponder. I do not have at my fingertips the exact details in regard to some statistics that I wish to use, but I do have the picture indelibly impressed in my mind, and I can give it to you in substance. There are two counties in Oklahoma, one of which is in my congressional district, that have lost more topsoil in the last 40 years than all of Ireland has lost in 2,000 years. As a matter of fact, we have been the most wasteful people on the face of the earth with our natural resources, and especially our soil. It has become, I am sorry to say, almost, if not, a national disgrace, and it does seem to me that if there is any place in the world where we ought to be very liberal in carrying out a program, it is right here in the field of soil conservation.

You know, we are not the largest nation in the world as far as land is concerned; it takes the sun 8 hours to cross Russia, and Russia is more than twice as large as we are from a square-miles-of-land standpoint. China is just a little bit smaller, as I remember the square miles, China proper; but China, with some of its outlying territories, is a little larger. Brazil, as I recall it, is just a little larger than we. So if we are to maintain the leadership of the world, we must be liberal in this matter contained in this appropriation bill right here.

Then there is one other thing. I do not claim to be a doctor, but I am interested in the health of my family and in my own health, in the health of my friends and in the health of America. I love America. We all do. We love this country. I am interested in the health of my fellow man of the people here in America, of you both on this side of the aisle and on the other side of the aisle. If I read current literature correctly, and I think I do, the greatest health-giving elements in our soil are right under our very feet. The minerals that are vital and necessary to our physical well being, we tread on every day. The most precious part of our soil is right on top and we are permitting so much of it to wash and blow away. If I read the health articles correctly that appear in our daily press and in our magazines and books, and if I am correctly informed, it is very probable that much of the heart trouble that is plaguing us, yes; and even cancer and other serious, deadly, and malignant diseases are, if not caused by, at least aggravated by, lack of proper minerals and other essential elements that ought to be in the food that we eat. It is not alone just the type of vegetables, fruit, and food generally that we eat that

does us so much good, but the quality of it as well. We are permitting our very lives to be washed and blown away.

Yes, it we are to maintain this leadership of the world, and all of us want to do that, we better not start cutting here. We better support the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] and raise it. That is what we ought to do; and of course we should defeat the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

(Mr. MORRIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

(Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, it is with the greatest regret that I find myself in an opposing position to some of my very good friends with whom I generally see eye to eye.

This bill teaches us that we people from the cities have got to take more of an interest in what goes on on the farm, because we are paying the bill. We are paying it in the form of the cost of food, and in this matter of appropriation involved, we are paying it, in addition, in taxes.

I think the point that has not been brought out as yet is what we are talking about. We are talking only about what individual farmers are to be paid for taking care of their own land. We have already passed an appropriation of over $50,000,000 for advising farmers on good soil conservation practices and this is proper, indeed. We are not dealing with that now. There are also appropriations which have to do with building dams and carrying out drainage and other works—in this or other bills—in order to preserve the land. We are dealing now only with what we pay the individual farmer for using fertilizers, spreading lime, plowing under certain crops, and similar practices.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. We are talking about soil conservation on a national basis, area wide. I think if you were to compile the amounts in this bill for that purpose, including all of these funds, it would be in excess of $325,000,000.

Mr. JAVITS. May I point out that according to the testimony before the committee it is made very clear what these payments are for. I should like to quote from page 539.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I gather from what the gentleman says that there might be a little element of payback here.

Mr. JAVITS. No.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say that if that is involved here, God save the country.

Mr. JAVITS. I agree with the gentleman. Nobody has moved to eliminate this or to cut it 95 percent. The biggest cut before us is only a cut of 40 percent. So there is no paybacks in what I say nor is any whatsover intended by me and I should like to stick solely to the facts.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am glad that the gentleman has prepared himself on this because, really, if there is anyone more dependent upon the farmer than the consumers in the city, I do not know who it is. The farmer is going to grow enough under any circumstances to feed himself. But those of us, like you and me, who are dependent upon that surplus which he has over and above his needs, which goes into the cities, are much more dependent on this bill right today than the farmer.

Mr. JAVITS. Might I tell the gentleman that there is no such thing as much more dependent? We in the cities are fully dependent upon the products of the farm and the farmer is fully dependent upon the city worker and employee for clothes and automobiles and machinery and often for the very fertilizer which he spreads on the ground. We are completely interdependent—city and country—and we should treat each other that way, and I propose for my part to proceed in that fashion.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, if he will get me more time.

Mr. SUTTON. As one who voted for public housing, coming from a rural section, I would like to say this: This appropriation for the soil-conservation program will enable your people in New York to buy food cheaper, because the farmer will produce more food at a cheaper price.

Mr. JAVITS. May I continue with my analysis of the situation:

The testimony before the committee shows the following—page 539:

> The rates of assistance vary by practices and by states and area so as to make the most effective use of available funds. The average rate of assistance for all practices is less than one-half the cost of performing the practice, the farmer bearing the balance of the cost.

So what we are dealing with here is how much of the cost the farmer shall get from the Government, whether he shall get 50 percent, 40 percent, 30 percent or what percentage he shall get, and on that I think the evidence from the farm areas is very good.

I quote now from the Des Moines Register, a newspaper published in the farm area, of January 4, 1951, this very year, and under an editorial headed "Here's a place to cut the Budget" speaking about these very soil conservation payments to individual farmers they say the following:

> In other words, most of this Government money is used to pay farmers for performing good farming practices—not for conservation, in the sense of saving the soil for future use. Most of the payments go to the higher-income farmers who ordinarily farm according to approved methods. Relatively little goes to the poorer farmers who do not use up-to-date methods. Thus, the ACP payments are primarily an outright cash subsidy to high-income farmers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BURDICK. I object, Mr. Chairman.

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, it has been said here that Mr. Kline, head of the Farm Bureau, has recommended this amendment. I received Mr. Kline's telegram. I also received more than 100 telegrams at the noon hour from farmers of my own district, including members of the Oklahoma Farm Bureau, every one of whom has said that he was in favor of retaining the committee bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment to reduce the authorization for the agricultural-conservation program for the year 1952. The committee in reducing this item to $225,000,000 has, in my judgment, cut it far too deep. To reduce it further to $150,000,000 would be one of the gravest errors this Congress could make at this time.

I am personally familiar with the benefits of this program in my own district. Through the aid which farmers have been given we have seen worn-out soil reclaimed and good soil saved.

The Government is calling upon American agriculture this year to produce record crops for the defense effort. Fertilizer is scarce and expensive. Unless farmers receive this assistance I am fearful that they will not be able to attain the goals set by the Department of Agriculture.

We hear a lot about the high cost of food and fiber. The only way to remedy this situation is through abundant production. Abundant production, in turn, is dependent upon the fertilizer and food and fiber-producing chemicals that are placed in the soil. This phase of the agricultural-conservation program is in every respect a defense measure. It is an anti-inflationary measure as well.

Many of the practices which have been approved by committees in my State and across the Nation are of a type designed to conserve the soil for the future benefit of this country. Many of these practices require years before dividends are returned to the farmer. The average farmer simply cannot tie up his small capital in a long-term investment. He is forced to realize a profit from year to year in order to feed and clothe and educate his family. Unless he is assisted by the Government, he will not be able to undertake many of these practices. If he fails to do so it will not be his loss so much as it will be a loss to future generations of Americans. This is not just a farm program. It is a program for all the people of this country, a program for

the continuation of a strong and productive America.

The program which this Congress has been sponsoring during recent years is going to pay dividends during this emergency. Soil-conservation practices have stored up a reservoir of mineral and organic substances in our soil which will enable our farmers to produce far more of the necessary food and fiber than they would have been able to produce had we not had an agricultural-conservation program. The big crops that will be planted and produced this year are going to take their toll. They are going to tap this reservoir. We will be making a mistake that we will live to regret if we start out on a program of taking more and more from the soil and putting less and less back into it. That is going to be the precise result of an agricultural policy based on stepping up production and simultaneously reducing the agricultural-conservation program.

I sincerely hope that the amendment to reduce this item will be defeated and that this Congress will go on record as being in favor of continuing at least on an even keel the great program which during these postwar years has become a standard policy of our Government.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think it might be said that inasmuch as the Des Moines Register said something that should not necessarily make it so. It might be that the writer of the editorial could have been influenced by their neighbor, Mr. Kline.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman may have a point there.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it may seem paradoxical for someone from New York City to stand in the well and talk about a farm bill. But when one considers it and gives it some thought they must recognize that we in New York City would starve without the help of those hard-working people who till the soil. During my service in this body I have supported my friends who have advocated the various agricultural projects such as this one of soil conservation. Our tall buildings may be fine as long as they are filled, and our factories are useful as long as they are working, but when human beings leave these places, they must be fed and their food is sent to them from your State and your State and your State.

So today I rise to support the committee and take issue with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

I was impressed, as I sat in the back of the Chamber and heard a member of the committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] say, "Let us have no coalition in reverse." I agree with him. Let us have no coalition at any time. It was the Democratic Party that won. Only a few days ago when the people of my city suffered because of the vote on the housing bill, I am afraid we had what looked like a coalition. But that is past. Let us work as a united party because it is not your district that counts or my district alone. It is the United States of America. We want the city people to have homes as we want the farmers to be prosperous. We want the farmers to be economically strong, and I call upon my friends from New York City, and the metropolitan districts, to support the committee and support the gentlemen from the farm areas.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. I wish the gentleman would understand that the coalition did not include all of the Representatives from agricultural districts.

Mr. McGRATH. I appreciate that, and if the gentleman remembers, I said it looked like a coalition. But I am sure I was a bit naive.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Does not the gentleman feel that at a time like this, I know the gentleman very well and know how he feels, we ought to speak not only of one party, but of one House of Representatives as Americans because that is what we are here for?

Mr. McGRATH. Why, definitely. I agree with the gentleman. The gentleman knows full well that in every speech that I have made in New York I have urged national unity. I have made some nice speeches about him, too, he has crossed the party line and done very fine things because he did that which he thought was for the good of the country. So I call on my colleague from New York City and Members from the big cities to support this bill. I am sure if we do that, the time will come when we can reason with our fellow members from the agricultural areas and they will understand our problems a little better.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. MARSHALL. We farmers from the Midwest are eternally grateful for the fine statesmanlike support we receive from gentlemen, like the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH], now addressing the Committee. We sincerely appreciate it. I would further like to call the attention of the gentleman that in setting aside this money and saying that this is a program for farmers we are a little bit at fault when we use that term because this is a program for all of the people of the country.

This is also a program that will not only safeguard our soil but will provide a great deal of security to the city districts in the future.

I would like to think when we speak of this appropriation that it is not an appropriation for farmers, but an appropriation for America.

Mr. McGRATH. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. I wonder if the gentleman does not mean that when we keep the soil the soil will keep us, whether we are from the farm or from the city.

Mr. McGRATH. The gentleman is correct. If we lose the soil we will be completely lost.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I would like to join my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], and extend to you the appreciation of the farmers of the South for the great interes' which the gentleman from New York shows in the welfare of all the people in the country.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. Let me remind the Committee that the farmers of America are patriots. They are deeply concerned with the peril in which this country finds itself. Like all good Americans they are demanding economy and the elimination of all unnecessary spending. They are willing to do without some of the things to which they may feel themselves entitled until this emergency is over. A good many references have been made here to an amendment offered by me last week reducing public housing. I propose to be consistent and I am supporting this amendment for many of the same reasons that I supported a reduction in public housing.

I have always contended that we need a good farm program. I shall continue to support a floor under farm prices and I think that floor should be at parity. I am as strong in favor of soil conservation as anyone. However, let us not make a shibboleth of soil conservation. Let us not waste any money in the name of soil conservation. This amendment has nothing to do with the Soil Conservation Service.

Mr. Chairman, I grew up on a farm, all of my people have been farmers for generations. The stability of the family-size farm is necessary to the stability of the Nation. This appropriation has nothing to do with the stability of the family-size farm. A reduction in this PMA appropriation will not hurt food production. It will eliminate some of the so-called soil-conserving practices. In my part of the country it will reduce tank building, fence building, and mesquite clearance for the time being. If we are going to reduce all other civilian spending, as I think we should, then we can well reduce this spending. A majority of the farmers in my district agree with this viewpoint. The farmers are willing to set an example for others to go by in the matter of economy.

This amendment has the official support of the Farm Bureau and numerous other farm organizations who wisely contend for reduced spending and a balanced budget. It ought to be adopted.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to my colleague from west Texas, a rancher.

Mr. FISHER. I also represent a district which is almost 100 percent agricultural and livestock raising. Practically every land owner is the recipient of benefits under this program. I asso-

ciate myself with the gentleman from Texas in supporting the Taber amendment.

If the gentleman will bear with me for a moment, I should like to point out that all this talk about the farmers and producers being so strong for this program should be examined. A lot of them are realistic and know that we cannot afford everything we might like during this grave emergency. A few months ago a newspaper in my district asked me for an expression of how we can cut expenses. I told the paper, among other things, that a substantial cut could and should be made in the program which we are now considering. Following that time the directors of the Texas Sheep and Goat Raisers' Association, numbering some 11,000 members, every one of whom are recipients of benefits under this program, unanimously approved my position. The directors of the Tom Green County Farm Bureau Federation met and unanimously commended me for the position I then took. The Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association in their convention in Dallas 2 months ago unanimously took a similar position. The New Mexico Cattle Raisers' Association did likewise. These people are all recipients under this program, but they are deeply concerned about the plight of the Federal Treasury. They are disturbed about the solvency of this country and they want to do something about it.

As the gentleman has pointed out, this reduction will have very little to do with soil conservation, as such. We have approved the soil conservation in a preceding section. It will go on as it should. It is a great program and one in which I am intensely interested. But this is another thing, a program that can be reduced without doing any violence whatever to food production or the productivity of the soil during this emergency.

It is often said that economy is a good thing if it is applied to the other fellow. Here is a chance to apply it across the board. I have been one who has voted consistently for reductions in Federal expenditures when other appropriation bill have been brought here. I have not hesitated to vote against nonessentials in other measures. So why not apply it here and cut this appropriation by $75,000,000. Most of the work will still go on. It is not going to hurt food production to any noticeable extent. I recognize, of course, that a lot of people like to get Government checks. But let us worry a little about the magnitude of the public debt. Let us look around for a chance to do some cutting, even though it affects us from the farming and ranching areas. Let us not say, "I am for retrenchments so long as it does not affect my own people." Let us let it apply across the board.

Mr. Chairman, the people down where I come from are genuinely alarmed about the magnitude of the public debt. They are disturbed about the solvency of this Nation, and they want to make necessary sacrifices in order to put our house in order. But they do not want their money wasted during this emergency on nonessentials, things that are fine but which they can get along without. This reduction can be justified. It is sound. It is a little hard to take by some, I realize. It may not be good politics to advocate cutting such aid to one's own people. But I have an idea the people do not want all this as bad as some who have spoken here today claim. These producers know what the score is. They know about the public debt and the need for retrenchment. They know it should apply to all, and they are willing to take their share, regardless of what some of the statements amount to that we have heard here today.

Mr. GOSSETT. I thank my colleague for his contribution.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I will yield briefly, but not for a lengthy statement.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say in reply to the distinguished gentleman from Texas who has just spoken [Mr. FISHER], he spoke for the sheep raisers, the goat raisers, and the cattle growers, none of whom plow the land, and therefore their soil does not wash away.

Mr. GOSSETT. They get a large part of this money for so-called soil-conserving practices.

Mr. RANKIN. All right. If they do not need it, let the farmers have it who do need it.

Mr. GOSSETT. They are not going to get but very little out of this appropriation.

Mr. RANKIN. If they do not want it, they do not have to take it.

Mr. GOSSETT. There is a great deal to be said for the viewpoint of the gentleman from New York, with whom I do not always agree. However, in this instance I am compelled to agree with some of his observations. There are about five different farm organizations in every county in the country. There is the Production Marketing Administration, the Soil Conservation Service, the Farmers Home Administration, the Extension Service, and usually the Farm Credit Administration. If we are going to be consistent, and if we are going to save this country from continued inflation due to reckless spending and save the country from economic collapse, we have to induce some efficiency entirely across the board. I, for one, intend to be consistent. When it applies to farm organizations, I say we can take it, and we will take our part of the cuts where necessary in interest of economic stability.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 50 minutes, the last 10 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objecton to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

(Mr. SUTTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, in 2½ minutes I want to say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that they are going to follow Mr. Kline who does not have 100 percent support of the Farm Bureau.

Mr. JENSEN. How does the gentleman know I am going to follow Mr. Kline?

Mr. SUTTON. I was not talking about you; I was talking about the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JENSEN. I am not following Mr. Kline in this instance.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield.

I may say to my friend from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that Mr. Kline was against the 75-cent minimum hour wage; he was against public housing; he was against the cotton bill last year, against liberalizing it to take care of hardship cases. Now he is against this just because he is a disappointed office seeker. He was in hopes that he would be Secretary of Agriculture under Tom Dewey. Personally I would much prefer to see some man like Cliff Hope as Secretary of Agriculture rather than a man like Allen Kline.

Mr. Chairman, this is something that will bring down prices for you people in the city, because if you improve the soil you will get more production. So if you people will go along with us we will produce more for you.

Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] is a little drastic in rasing it to $285,000,000, I think we should stick to the committee figure of $225,000,000. We should maintain this, for it has already been allocated. We have made the commitment to the farmers and we should not go back on our promise to these people, because it would prove embarrassing not only to the Democratic Party, but to the Republican Party everywhere, in Congress and out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] is recognized.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, it is not the purpose for which this money is appropriated that my people back home object to; it is the way it is being used. I represent more cranberry farmers than any man in the world, and we raise more cranberries in my district. You came down there and paid men who had anywhere from $10,000 to $200,000 invested, paid them for sanding their bogs, when there was not a soul in my district believed that they ought to have done it or who believe that they ought to do it today. Certainly if a man can afford to invest $100,000 in a cranberry bog he can afford to put sand, fertilizer, or whatever it is they put on cranberry bogs, to make it grow.

You do not need to worry about the farmers; they will get along this year

and next year; and you will not need to worry about production because plenty will be raised.

We are not destroying this soil conservation program; all we are doing is cutting down a little so that we may buy guns and munitions of war to protect our lives. No one should think the whole program is gone because the gentleman from New York moves to cut it down a little.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this is a question that will confront the American people for generations yet to come. We have been very slow in realizing just what we are really confronted with in the washing away of our soil.

There is as much soil in the world as there ever was; it is just at the wrong place. The time will come—listen to this—the time will come when the American people will be using the facilities and inventions of our modern civilization to take the muck, the soil that is washed down into the mouths of our streams, and return it to the land.

Let me give you an example. In the Philippine Islands they have been using rice terraces for 1,500 years. Every fall they would go down into the valley and dig the muck out of the bottoms of the ditches, put it in bags or sacks, and take it back and put it on the land. In that way they have been able to produce rice throughout the centuries on land that otherwise would have been washed away probably centuries ago. Their soil would have been entirely gone in many areas if this had not been done.

I realize that some of this money may be wasted, but I should hate to turn the fate of the farmers I represent over to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and let him try to teach them how to milk ducks.

He would probably be like one fellow who came down from the city and decided he would do a little farming. He bought a milk cow. When he went out to milk her she kept switching her tail; the flies were pretty bad. He took out his book and read where it said, "If the cow switches her tail, tie the tail to a leg."

He misunderstood that, and tied it to his leg. She broke and ran, and he said later that she had not gone 200 yards with him until he saw his mistake.

I represent more small farmers than almost any other Member in Congress. The average farm in my county is around 60 acres. It is one of the most productive counties in America. I know what this soil erosion means. I know it is something to which the Congress had better turn its attention, rather than giving billions of American money to Europe, Asia, Africa, Israel, or Japan, or to some other country that is not interested in the welfare of the American people.

As far as I am concerned, I shall support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], and if that fails I shall support the bill as reported by the committee.

We have waited too long now about rebuilding the soil for the American people now and for generations to come.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, this is one time when I rise to speak where I have no personal interest in the matter. I live in western North Dakota, one of the last virgin spots of prairie soil in the United States. Our soil has not started to deteriorate. Maybe 100 years from now we will have to dredge the Gulf of Mexico and bring our soil back, but we are all right at the present moment, but we are here legislating for the entire country, the North, the South, the East, and the West.

I know what the soil is in the East—while in Congress I live down in Maryland and you could not raise an umbrella on that soil without fertilization and soil conservation. The farmers there are too poor to afford to rest their lands and practice soil conservation without some aid from the Government. Many old sections of the United States are in the same condition.

You Members do not understand, or many of you believe, that we are engaged in world war III, but I believe we are. Do you want to shut off that weapon that will win this war? It has won every war this country was ever engaged in—I refer to food. If it appears to you that this is the thing to do go right ahead, in the name of economy which you preach this afternoon, and do it. We can live longer in my section of the country on our wheat than you can in the East on your manufactured articles.

I listened with great interest to the speech of that bonanza tractor farmer from New York—where his broad acres of waving grain are contained within city limits—the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and I hope I may be excused if I chance to depart from his advice on this bill. I was also eager to learn the position to be taken by that other prominent power farmer of New York where his vast acreage of waving corn flourishes on Fifty-sixth Street. From his actual experience in large farm operations I felt I must follow his advice. He said to me, "Do you know anything about this bill?" I said, "How could I? You know it all, so there is nothing left for me."

But alas! I could not follow the advice of either of these noted and distinguished farm operators.

If you want to curtail production of food in the name of false economy you can save $75,000,000, but tomorrow or next week you will not hesitate to vote another $500,000,000 to Yugoslavia, to try to win Tito away from Stalin. I do not know how these two gentlemen will vote on appropriations for foreign countries which will soon be before Congress, but it is a sure thing that many Members, who now preach economy, will vote for billions to be given away to foreign countries. Those who vote billions for foreign countries shout "economy" and almost shed tears over appropriations to assist the people of the United States. This same situation must have arisen in Shakespeare's time for he remarked once, "Consistency! Thou art a jewel."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

(Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I think this appropriation should be cut below what we have been spending for this activity, but I do not believe it should be cut 40 percent as proposed by the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. Neither do I believe it should be increased at this time as would be the case under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL]. You can say what you want, but this is a sound program. There may be some money wasted. I expect anyone could go out and find some instance of waste just as he could in the case of any Government program. But it is becoming a better program all the time and one in which the country is getting its money's worth for the amount spent.

It has been said before, but I think it can well be emphasized, that the reason for our high standard of living in this country is in the main, because we have had a soil originally so rich, and farmers so competent that 15 percent of our people living on the farms can produce enough food and enough other farm products to take care of the rest of us. You can go to China and India and the backward countries of the world and it takes 85 to 90 percent of the people to feed 100 percent. Here 15 percent can do it, leaving 85 percent of the people to produce the luxuries and conveniences which give us the high standard of living which we enjoy.

But we can do this only as long as we can maintain the fertility of our soil. Much of our topsoil has already been lost, much of the original fertility is gone. But thank God we are restoring it through sound conservation programs as provided for in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be yielded to the gentleman from Kansas.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Does the gentleman remember when he was chairman of our committee and that great committee made a trip all over this country from coast to coast interviewing farmers, large and small, and, as I remember

their reaction to all of the programs that had been inaugurated, they were more in favor of soil conservation, is that not correct?

Mr. HOPE. That is absolutely correct and I am glad the gentleman calls attention to that matter because I can sincerely say that this trip convinced me as I had never been convinced before of the value of this program. We went into every part of the country, in New England, in the South, in the Southwest, in the Corn Belt, and out on the Pacific coast. We found there might be differences of opinion among farmers on other subjects but there were no differences of opinion on the value of this program.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I was privileged to take that particular trip out West with the gentleman's committee, and that is my recollection. Practically every man or woman who got up to address this committee on that trip, at those three or four occasions, Denver, Salt Lake City, and Spokane, among others, were in agreement as to the good work of this particular program.

Mr. HOPE. My recollection, of course, is the same as that of the gentleman. At every 1 of the 12 formal meetings we held, as well as many informal meetings, the testimony on the part of the farmers was the same. They wanted this program continued.

And if the 85 percent of our people living off of our farms are smart they will want it continued also because they can only maintain their high standards of living as long as the farms of this country continue to produce abundantly.

I think the committee has acted wisely in making a moderate cut in this appropriation. Farmers want to do their share in balancing the Federal budget. But there is no logic and no real economy in making a 40-percent cut as urged by the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

(Mr. PROUTY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Chairman, I know of no legislative body which is more conscientious in its approach to questions involving appropriations than the Vermont Legislature.

In a sense each member sets himself up as an individual committee to weigh the pros and cons involved in the expenditure of public funds. The members are not niggardly or parsimonious. They can be and, on occasion, are very generous but they are aware, too, that there are times when appropriations are not in the general interest regardless of the worthiness of the purposes for which they are intended. Vermont appropriates funds to carry on the activities of government on a highly selective basis, and all such proposals have to be justified beyond a reasonable doubt before they are approved.

I mention these characteristics of the Vermont Legislature because it seems to me that it adds emphasis to its action in passing a joint resolution advocating that Congress appropriate $285,000,000 for the conservation and use of agricultural land resources. This resolution was adopted only after the most searching analysis and I am sure it represents a studied conclusion that in Vermont, at least, the merits of the program have been proven by results.

Some twelve to fifteen thousand Vermont farmers are participating in the program and in most instances they are spending far in excess of the funds received from the Federal Government.

To my mind even more important than the incentives provided to farmers for proper land use is the growing recognition of the urgent need for sound measures to conserve our natural resources as a result of this program.

The annual growth of our forest resources equals only about two-thirds of annual consumption. Nature requires anywhere from 300 to 1,000 years to create a single inch of topsoil, and about a third of this Nation's has been allowed to blow or wash away. It has been estimated that the annual cost to the United States as a result of uncontrolled erosion and water runoff amounts to about $4,000,000,000 annually, and that only 100,000,000 of the Nation's 460,000,000 acres of cropland can be counted secure against erosion.

In a very real sense modern agriculture and industry are undermining the very essentials necessary to their continued existence, and it is most important that we recognize this fact or the time may come when we shall be unable to produce enough for our people to eat and wear.

It seems to me that to reduce the appropriation to a level at least below that recommended by the committee would be a great mistake, because this would have the effect of drastically curtailing efforts to meet one of our greatest national needs, and at a time when increased production is so vital.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

(Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. HALLECK.)

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, in my time here in Congress I have voted for most of the agricultural programs. I voted for the Soil Conservation Act. I did not vote for the Compulsory Control Act of 1938, and I have lived long enough to have many people applaud me for that action.

In the years I have been here, and more in recent years, I hear Members get up and talk about the great things these programs have done for the farmers and what a great deal has been accomplished by the Administration program. I am something of a farmer myself. I have owned a farm since 1935. I have a couple of them now. They are good, black, flat land out in Indiana, that produce very well. Practically of that land is in cultivation. So when I talk about some of these things I speak from practical experience, I have here my north farm book, in which I have been writing down from year to year the prices I have been getting.

Let us not criticize the programs but let us keep the record straight as we see first just what happened in respect to farm prices until World War II came along. Of course, when you get in war you cure about everything as far as prices are concerned.

I had that farm in 1938. Would you be surprised to know that that year I sold my wheat for 53 cents a bushel, my oats for 19 cents, and a lot of my corn for 33 cents? That is after we had had 5 years of these programs. Those prices are practically those of the depth of the depression.

Let us go on to 1939. I sold wheat for 57 cents a bushel, oats 23 cents, and my corn crop that I had that fall went for 40 cents a bushel. You farmers that know about these things do those sound like great big prices accomplished by some very efficient administration that rushed to the aid of the farmers? They are a little higher than they were at the depth of the depression, but not very much.

In 1940 what happened? I sold my corn for 51 cents. I sold oats for 26 cents a bushel. That is the record, and it ought to be borne in mind.

As to this particular amendment, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I supported a similar amendment—only an amendment that went further than this—back in 1947 and 1948. I took the trouble then to break down the payments going to my 12 counties out in Indiana, and they aggregated about $1,000,000. But I supported the amendment to cut it to $150,000,000 the following year and then to do away with it completely. I do not recall getting any substantial criticism for that action.

The trouble with this economy business is that we are all for economy if we will take the "me" out of it. That is the reason, knowing as I do that of this amount here to be appropriated, a very considerable amount will go into my district, that I am going to stand up in the House and say that it ought to be cut. I am going to vote to cut it.

I do not know how we are going to keep this country solvent unless we do that very thing. I could go into greater detail on this subject because, as I say, I am something of a telephone farmer. I know that out there we have learned if you sow clover with the oats and let it go to hay and seed, the second year you can raise two wacking corn crops right after that. You do not have to pay the farmers out there to plant some of his land to clover in a good crop rotation practice. He is going to do that anyway.

The cuts here proposed will leave plenty of money to carry on this program wherever it needs to be carried on.

Again may I say I do not know of any way we can meet the challenge which confronts us here as duly elected representatives responsible for the solvency of our Government—yes, and for the

value of the dollar—unless we are willing to make these cuts and to make them even where it may hurt a little.

Very shortly we are going to struggle again with the question of price controls and wage controls. A great many farm people are disturbed about price and wage controls. They see what they do to them. One of the things basically which needs to be done is to put our financial house in order. When we do that we will begin to preserve and protect the value of the dollar which in my opinion is No. 1 on the domestic agenda for this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

(Mr. SCUDDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, coming from that great nonpartisan State of California, I hate to see partisanship brought into the discussion on this measure. We have been giving, or rather the Democrats have been taking credit for the soil-conservation program. We should go back a little further, some 85 years ago when Mr. Lincoln was President of the United States. He had enacted the soil-conservation measure and for some 70 years following that nothing was ever done to start soil conservation. If we are going to give anybody credit for this, you might say that out of the depression was born soil conservation, because it was primarily started to take care of the unemployment throughout the country.

I had two ranches in the Gold Ridge Conservation District which was the first district to be formed in California. I know what this program is and I have had the benefit of some of it. I believe, however, the amendment to increase this fund should be defeated. The farmers in my district are asking for economy and they are willing that economy be practiced in the field of agriculture as well as elsewhere. I just received a copy of a letter from the secretary of the Gold Ridge Soil Conservation District, and I would like to read it to you. It is directed to Mr. Waters S. Davis, Jr., National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

The letter is as follows:

GOLD RIDGE SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT,
Sebastopol, Calif., April 30, 1951.

WALTER S. DAVIS, JR.,
National Association of Soil Conservation Districts,
League City, Tex.

DEAR SIR: We directors of the Gold Ridge Soil Conservation District, Sebastopol, Calif., are of the belief that the Conservation District movement is the democratic way of doing the conservation job. The entire program is directly in the hands of the farmer. We now have 75 percent of the Nation's farms and ranches within Soil Conservation Districts. These districts if given a free hand and the time, can complete the conservation job ahead without farmer-conservation-subsidy. Conservation farming is profitable, and we are therefore interested in making conservation work pay its own way. At present there are two methods of selling conservation farming to the farmer; one is the Soil Conservation district method which fundamentally is adjusting farming to fit the land and may involve several farming practices on the same acre of land, the other method is the practice subsidy program which does not necessarily give the farm nor a portion thereof sufficient consideration for a sound land use and farming economy.

We believe that the soil conservation district program should be given the chance to do the job for which it has been equipped without interference from any other program which divides authority on conservation.

The Soil Conservation district program is working. The program does not come from Washington and as farmers learn to differentiate the Government program from their own district program they find a distinct and enduring liking for the latter.

Sincerely yours,
GOLD RIDGE SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT,
D. H. FOUTS.
BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
By D. H. FOUTS, *Secretary.*

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] is recognized.

(Mr. WINSTEAD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Taber amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to protest against the efforts of those who would curb us who are trying to maintain the fertility of our soil during this period of emergency. We are asking the farmers of this country to produce beyond anything they have ever done. The Department of Agriculture says that it will take more than 21,000,000 additional acres in soil-depleting crops than we had last year. This means we should increase our attention toward the preservation of the fertility of our soil. After all this soil conservation payment is only a payment in that it is a contribution toward the cost of soil-improving practices. Prior to the time of this program this country had wasted its resources at a faster rate than any country in history. Under this program the Government puts up about a third of the cost and the farmer puts up about two-thirds of the cost, but the total amount goes into the restoration of our soil and its productive capacity. This Nation has expended billions of dollars since the last war in foreign aid programs. Many of them I have voted against. Nevertheless, we have through that means required in the spending of counterpart funds much larger sums on the restoration of the forests and soils of foreign nations than is involved in the present appropriation.

Today we have large food shortages in our own Nation, and yet a big part of available food comes from the fact that we have in the last 10 or 12 years given attention to increasing the ability of our pastures, through pools and grasses and other means to support more and more cattle. Through these programs we have increased the production of our soil. We have gained 19,000,000 people in the last 10 years. At that rate of increase the demands upon our soil will become ever greater as the years go by.

Prior to the present emergency we had very strict limitations upon the production of cotton and many other commodities. In my section of the country it meant that many farmers had to convert their farms to other commodities rather than cotton. The soil program helped tremendously to meet that need of converting over to beef or some other commodity which was required by law passed by this Congress.

I plead with you not to be short-sighted as to reduce this program. In my judgment it should be strengthened. Other countries are in the shape they are in today because they have consistently taken more out of the soil than they put back in. For the period of our history we have been more guilty of that than any other nation in history. A few years ago we set out to stop the drawing out of more than we put back into our soil. Now of all times we should strive in every way to continue that policy of preserving for future generations the ability and capacity of this country to give us adequate food and fiber to maintain the high standard of living which we now enjoy.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, my record in voting for economy in the operation of Government will, I believe, stand the test of severest scrutiny. I am just as much in favor of eliminating wasteful expenditures in our agricultural program as I am in other and unrelated Government undertakings. In supporting the position of the committee on this amendment, I am thoroughly convinced that the ends of economy will be served, but that further reductions in appropriations for this program, such as proposed in the Taber amendment, would, in the end, react against the cause of economy, and would, to all intents and purposes be an act of false economizing.

No program ever undertaken by a department of the Government has met with such signal success and general acceptance as has our program of soil conservation. God has blessed us with the gift of fertile soil; the maintaining of that fertility is a responsibility which we must assume ourselves. We owe it not only to ourselves, but to future generations, to see that their inheritance will not be a land devoid of fertility and incapable of producing the food and fiber necessary to sustain life. Mr. Chairman, I intend to oppose the Taber amendment and the Marshall substitute; and, instead, to support the bill as originally presented to the House by the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations, on which my able friend and colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], has done such a magnificent job.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is recognized.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I, of course, understand that the soil-conservation program is not the program of any person or political party. This great program came into being because Members of Congress of both parties were impressed with the importance of protecting and conserving the soil of this

great Nation. During the consideration of the legislation which finally was enacted and culminated in this very worthwhile activity, partisan politics did not once lift its ugly head. In the success of the soil-conservation program all Members of Congress can take just pride. No one person or political party should claim full credit. It might well be said that this agency of the Government is a child with two parents, the Democratic and Republican Party.

The gentleman who has just preceded me mentioned Abraham Lincoln, the patron saint of the Republican Party. It was exactly 89 years ago today that Abraham Lincoln signed the bill which created the Department of Agriculture of the United States Government. In considering the matter now before us we should not be actuated by the spirit of partisan politics.

As I have listened to this debate and to the arguments which have been submitted for and against the pending amendment, I have been keenly conscious of the meritorious activities of this great agency of the Government. A distinguished North Carolinian, Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, is frequently referred to as the father of soil conservation for the reason that he has done more to make the people of our Republic soil conscious. Dr. Bennett, as no other man in all history, aroused all America to the sad realization that we were rapidly depleting the fertile topsoil of our farm lands. Once aroused, the people of the country sought to do something about the situation. Under this great program farmers have been taught something about the arts of agriculture and the value of diversified farming and soil-building practices. While I appreciate the fact that the soil-conservation program we are now discussing is not the program of the Soil Conservation Service, the agency which Dr. Bennett directs, it is nonetheless a program of importance and one which goes hand in hand with all of the programs of the Soil Conservation Service. Unfortunately, on account of a lack of both money and manpower, the Soil Conservation Service has not been able to reach or to serve all of the families of the Nation, but it is making great progress and bringing great lessons to all of the people of America. Through the program we are now discussing we have reached more farmers and have encouraged better practices on more farms than the Soil Conservation Service has been able to reach or to serve. Actually this program working alongside of the Soil Conservation Service has just about revolutionized agriculture in my district and in my State. Our people have been encouraged to diversify their farming and to preserve their soil and to engage in soil-building practices. They have not only been encouraged, but by these payments have been induced and persuaded to engage in many activities beneficial to their farms and better farming. North Carolina farmers have been encouraged to increase their pasture lands and to go into the business of producing beef cattle and building dairy herds, and under the program we are making magnificent progress.

Perhaps this program should be refined or altered or changed, but this is neither the time nor the place for us to make such modifications or changes. If the program is to be improved, the matter should be considered first by the legislative committee charged with the responsibility of drafting legislation. If certain farmers are receiving benefits which they should not receive, that is a matter which should be considered, and I assure you that it will be considered, and if it appears that legislation should be presented, I can assure you that our committee will present it. I urge you not to destroy or to peril this program which has meant so much to the farmers of the Nation and which will mean so much to generations yet unborn.

We must look down the long corridors of time; yes, down the road a thousand years from now, to evaluate this program properly. No man knows the value of an acre of land. Not all of the mathematicians, economists, and experts in all of the departments of the Government can tell us the actual value of the top soil of even one acre of American farm land. If it is protected through the years, it will be a blessing to generations yet unborn. We are here engaged in a program, the primary purpose of which is the storing up for future use of the fertility of the farm lands of our country, and, I repeat, the richest resources of our Nation.

If this Nation is to continue on the road of progress, we must maintain our agricultural economy and we must protect the foundation upon which that economy must be built, and that is upon the farms and ranches of America.

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate our good friend the gentleman from Mississippi, JAMIE WHITTEN, and the members of his subcommittee. Yes, I want to congratulate all the friends of agriculture and all of the farsighted members of the Appropriations Committee. They have made a contribution to the cause of economy and have, in a scientific way, made many reductions and accomplished many economies. I urge you again not to use an awkward meat ax on this important appropriation. I hope that the Taber amendment will be defeated and that you will stand by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and his committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I think the chairman of the great Committee on Agriculture the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is to be complimented for dragging this discussion above the partisan level. I certainly cannot understand the kind of political argument that dragged us back to the days of 1931 and 1932, when we had a Democratic House and a Republican in the White House and laid all the ills at the White House door, but when you come to talk about the Republican Eightieth Congress and a Democrat in the White House, that same gentleman seeks to lay all the ills of the country at the door of the Congress instead of the White House. In the same kind of partisan vein we hear this appeal against a coalition. If I ever heard an appeal for a coalition, and a disgraceful coalition at that, it was the argument on the part of the city folks, "We are going along with you and vote for this, but don't forget us when public housing comes around," a disgraceful coalition to raid the Treasury of the United States.

I think I represent as good an agricultural district as lies beneath the sun in this country, but I do not think the dairy farmers of Wisconsin want me here to be for economy for everybody else but to consider the dairy cows of my district as sacred cows. I concur in what the Farm Bureau has said, that the need for economy is so great that we must all bear a share of the burden that has to come from it, and I am going to support the Taber amendment down the line.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recognized.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this amendment should be an illustration of the importance of trying to do the reasonable thing rather than trying to do the spectacular thing. Of course, we are all for economy. I think most of us sincerely want economy. I think we would all like to see the expenditures of government reduced. But is the pending Taber amendment likely to result in any reduction of Government expenditures? If a majority of this House votes for it this afternoon, it will look good in tomorrow morning's papers, but do you really expect such a meat-ax cut to be sustained in the other body? Is it not reasonable to suppose that by accepting the committee figure you can actually reduce governmental expenditures by $60,000,000, whereas by passing an extreme amendment you may well achieve nothing more lasting than your name in tomorrow morning's papers? Do you want to cut expenses or do you want publicity?

I think we can reduce the expenditures of government. I think this committee has done a splendid job in reducing expenditures. It has brought in a bill which consistently reduces the sums appropriated for about every agency of the Department. It has made a $60,000,000 cut on a very vital activity of the Department. That is a very large cut, almost 25 percent. It is a much larger cut than we have made on most other items. Now it is urged that we record ourselves as favoring a gesture of a 50-percent cut, which would probably never be more than a gesture. It seems to me you get over on the ground of being ridiculous when you cut that far. Let us keep our promises within the realm of our ability to deliver.

Let us not get off on wild extremes; let us not try to make this a matter of partisan advantage or of personal advantage. I think that it must be fairly said that within the last 6 years we have had two great chairmen of the Com-

mittee on Agriculture, the present chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and our immediate past chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]. One is a Democrat, the other a Republican. Under both these men we have had, I think most intelligent, enlightened, and progressive leadership of agriculture in this country. The same can be said for the two gentlemen who have during the same period served as chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

I think it is a sad day when anyone appears on this floor and tries to use a program of this kind to promote votes for either the Democratic or the Republican party; I think it is a sad day when the extreme left wing or the extreme right wing comes out here and uses this great program of maintenance of the fertility of our soil as a means of keeping someone in or putting someone out of Congress. I think it is far better that we try to follow a policy that will feed our children for a thousand years, a policy that will guarantee to America the ability to maintain a high standard of living for generations yet to come.

If you go so far as to destroy this program, you jeopardize the whole future of this country. If you go to the other extreme proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], I fear we might indeed halt all of the desirable trend toward real economy. We must cut appropriations. We must cut those which mean most to our own interest if we are to expect any reductions to the appropriations in which we are not directly interested. I have been voting for cuts all along the line. I propose that we join with the committee in making a $60,000,000 cut on an item which is especially dear to me and to my people, but I cannot concur with those who would single out our conservation program for a cut of nearly 50 percent when I know that the results of this program are probably the most lasting of any for which we make appropriations. I urge you to follow a reasonable, a common sense, and a nonpartisan course of action.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Taber amendment. First, I would like to echo what my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], has just had to say about the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture. If you have examined the report which accompanies the bill and the analysis of the various items which appear in the back of the report, you will not find a single plus mark opposite the amounts appropriated. With the exception of a very few items, each and every recommendation made to the Appropriations Committee by the Bureau of the Budget was materially reduced by this economy-minded committee. The committee has made substantial cuts in almost every item and increased none above the budget recommendation. Those of us who advocate and fight for economy should express our thanks to this committee.

As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has just said, this committee reduced this particular item not by just a nominal sum, but by $60,000,000. I am one of those who has been voting for a majority of the economy amendments that have been offered on this floor. And I want to say to you that I would be voting for an amendment to reduce this appropriation if the committee had not already done a good job itself. Now when the subcommittee has recognized the necessity for a reduction in appropriations and has acted accordingly by reducing this item by $60,000,000 and the over-all appropriation bill by more than 12 percent, then I think that is all we or the public can reasonably expect.

I think it is rather unfortunate that some of the officials of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which I think is one of the outstanding farm organizations of America, have gotten themselves involved in support of this amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. COOLEY. I wish to point out that the Farm Bureau Federation is taking the position it takes by virtue of a one-vote margin. Had other members of the committee been present they would not have taken the position they are taking. I know that from the Farm Bureau people in my State.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to my former chairman, whom the Republicans would do well to follow on this amendment.

Mr. HOPE. Is it not the position of the Board of Directors of the Farm Bureau rather than the position of the members of the Farm Bureau?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Both of my friends are correct. As I was saying, I think it is most unfortunate that the bureau has become involved in this amendment. I have a very high regard for Allan Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau. I credit him with having done much for the good of American agriculture. There are times, however, when I must differ with him and this is one of those times. In passing, I think I should say that, in my judgment, a vast majority of the bureau members would oppose this amendment. It so happens that I am a member of the bureau, in good standing, I hope, and I certainly oppose it.

A few years ago, the House Committee on Agriculture under the able leadership of my good friend, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], traveled from one end of this country to the other. We visited in New England, the Middle Atlantic States, the South, the West, and far West. We traveled by bus so that we might make frequent stops. We met farmers in small towns, on the farms, and on the roadsides. At every stop we asked questions about this program. There were differences of opinion on several of the programs inaugurated for agriculture but this is the one program on which we found unanimous agreement. It has remolded American agriculture. It came almost too late but our farmers and the country as a whole are thankful that it came in time.

Land fertility is our greatest natural resource. It must be preserved. Year in and year out, in good times and bad, so long as this Nation shall exist, people and productive land will be the principal elements upon which we must depend for prosperity and security. It might be a fair statement to say that the world position of the United States a century hence may be foretold now by the manner in which we guard our resources, particularly our people and our land.

By comparison with Europe ours is a young country. By comparison with the ancient civilizations of Asia and Africa, it is still younger. Yet, in the century and a half since our people began to sweep over the Alleghenies, across the prairies of the Middle West, through the Rockies and Sierras and on to the Pacific, we have run through vast stocks of productive land and timber. We have depleted our basic wealth faster by far than any other nation in history. Another century and a half of equal waste could make the United States a historical "has been," unable to feed its own people adequately, much less to use its food and fiber, as now, to encourage peace and democracy on the earth.

Our cropland has remained remarkably stable for a quarter of a century indicating that we have at long last reached the approximate limits of net expansible cropland. What we have gained by taking in new cropland during the past 25 years, we have lost to an equal extent in land discarded for crops due to loss of soil fertility.

We thus face the cruel truth that we can no longer expand onto and exploit virgin fertile soils; but must face the necessity of husbanding our soil resources in the future to even maintain our land supply in the face of a large prospective expansion of mouths to feed.

The seriousness of the situation is further accentuated by the fact that we have not learned to check our frightful waste of soil. Erosion damage is still going on at a rate of $2,000,000,000 of impairment of our farm lands per year. We have already practically ruined for further tillage a fifth of our tillable land.

I know that you have heard over and over these startling facts told in various ways. I repeat them only to emphasize that this waste is continuing in the face of a still growing population and a rigidly stable crop acreage for the past quarter of a century.

With few exceptions there are no more virgin lands. It is therefore of extreme consequence that the loss of soil fertility be checked. May the day never come when this great country of ours will become a mass importer of food as are many countries of the world today. But it can happen. May the day never come when our farm people will be forced to further crowd into our already overcrowded cities for a livelihood. That, too, can happen. Why, in the last 10

years approximately 20 percent of the people have left the farms and moved to the cities. Many left because they had permitted their lands to become so depleted that they could no longer be profitably farmed. With a little more incentive they might have remained and restored the fertility required to make the land economically productive.

There is new hope now through soil conservation. We are checking this terrible waste of our natural wealth and restoring farm life to the enviable independency which it offers.

Mr. Chairman, it is in the interest of the farmer and the consumer, it is in the interest of this and generations to follow, it is in the interest of everyone, that our soil be preserved.

Mr. Chairman, the Taber amendment which concededly will reduce and hamper our soil-conservation program is a step in the wrong direction. It should be defeated.

(Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, at the outset of my remarks I wish to compliment the committee for the good job it has done on this bill as a whole. I yield to no Member of Congress in my support for funds for genuine soil-conservation practices. Mr. Chairman, I honestly believe that the farmers of America as a group are the deepest thinking people in America and are to a degree more concerned about the future of America than most any other group in our Nation. They know we must reduce our staggering Federal expenditures and they are willing to take their share of the cut. I am sure that is a correct and a fair statement of their position. So I shall support the amendment to reduce this appropriation for next year in the sum of $50,000,000 below the amount recommended by the committee.

Mr. Chairman, it is very apparent that some of the folks from the city districts do not understand the value of the farm to the welfare of all. May I remind those Members that for every dollar the farmer takes in, labor received $4.20 in wages and for every dollar the farmer takes in the businessman receives $4.10 in trade and that the national income over the past 20 years since our farms have become mechanized has been almost exactly seven times the farm income. Please remember that all wealth springs from the soil. It follows that if the farmer does not get along then certainly the city folks will have a bad time. If we do not conserve our precious soil certainly our children and their children will suffer no end. But I do believe, Mr. Chairman, that the farmers of America are willing to take a cut in this appropriation and they will still conserve the soil. They know this House has made cuts already in many Federal agencies, and the farmers are ready and willing to take their share of cuts under present conditions in order to stave off national bankruptcy. I know that is a fact.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] to close the debate.

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, General MacArthur, when he was testifying before a committee of the Senate was asked about China by Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and this was his answer:

> It is a country of poverty. The slightest dislocation in their normal processes of distribution causes the greatest convulsions in various sections of Chinese society. If you, for instance, disturb in the slightest degree the distributive systems of their food, you might well have 50,000,000 men, 50,000,000 people, starving at any one time.
>
> They live only a couple of jumps ahead of starvation. In other materials, they are almost as bad. They have practically no indigenous products that they can manufacture; they have no great manufacturing centers whatsoever.
>
> They are peculiarly vulnerable to the process of blockade. And the process of internal disruption by bombing.

You may say that is not going to happen in the United States of America, but let me say that in the brief period of 175 years of our existence we have exhausted our natural resources to a greater extent than did the nation of China in any 2,000-year period you can point out, according to the best judgment of people that we have who have made a study of that situation.

Every time this program comes up we have to meet the argument that this is a payment. If this were a payment to the farmers under present conditions I would say, "Cut it out." But this is a question of soil conservation. Under our laws we do not use the power of Government as did Hitler and Stalin. We do not say by law to the farmer, who is a trustee of our very means of existence, that "You have got to maintain the fertility of the soil." May that day never come. But, if we do have as a Nation an interest in the fertility of the soil, and in its productivity and if we are not going to require that it be taken care of by law, the only way to do it is by a system of leadership, by a system of Federal recognition of its responsibilities; yes, by a system of the Federal Government paying a part of the cost. I am not happy at the figure $225,000,000. It is a $60,000,000 reduction that we are making in next year's program. The fact that our subcommittee made that reduction does not mean that it is lessened in the least in its belief in the value of soil conservation and of the real dependency of our people, as well as future generations upon it. But how much the Government can spend depends upon what it can get the farmers to do, and I say to you if you were to put a billion and a half dollars in this bill for this purpose, there is a serious question whether you could get more soil conservation that you can for the $225,000,000 contribution toward the costs. Why? Because with the present shortages of labor, shortages of fertilizer, shortages of equipment, when the farmer finds it hard to do his regular day's work, it is hard for him to do those things so badly needed for soil fertility. The amount of money in this bill is not necessarily the measure of what we can get him to do. Now, you may say "Well if that be true, why will not $150,000,000 be enough?" I want to say to you that we need every bit of soil conservation we can help bring about. There was a period in this country when we did reduce soil-conservation practices of $150,000,000. Oh, you heard the argument here today that the farmers will carry on, but I would like to get them to look at the records. In 1947 over my protest we did reduce this program, and in 1948 the number of dams to conserve water for irrigation, for livestock, to control erosion, was reduced 45 percent. The number of range and pasture seedlings was reduced 33 percent; contour farming by 49 percent; closed range fell off 41 percent; irrigation ditches, dikes, and laterals fell off 52 percent; improving pasture and range land by eradicating poisonous plants fell off 52 percent, and we had approximately 50 percent falling off in the practices of soil conservation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. There has been talk about coalition and there has been talk here about the effect of what Mr. Kline says, that it does not necessarily present the position of the Farm Bureau. I received a telegram from Mr. Kline in which he says that he specifically urges support of the Cox amendment to the agricultural appropriation bill to reduce the fund for 1952 to $150,000,000. Is not that the effect of this amendment?

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman heard the amendment read. The amendment said $150,000,000, so the figure is the same. I am no party to a coalition. I am willing to join with anyone at any time when they are acting in what I believe to be the best interest of the country, but to join anyone against everything, is not my way, and as long as other folks are doing what they think is right, that is for them to determine. But back to this matter, and this is vital to us: It is not a case of saving money here; it is a case of whether we have a little bit of long-range interest and a long-range viewpoint in regard to the future of this country. I heard the gentleman from Indiana—and there is no brighter or abler man in this Congress, in my judgment—and I heard my close friends, the two distinguished gentlemen from Texas talk about farming. I also heard the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] speak on this issue. You know, the only real good ways to make lots of money farming that I know are these: One is to strike oil on your land, and lots of people in Texas have done that, I hear. The other good way to farm, and that is the way the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Indiana and myself farm, is to have a good salary on the side, and I cannot help but say, the people of the Nation would be in a bad way if they had to depend upon the production of those kind of farmers for their food and clothing.

But this program reaches further than that class of farmer. This program reaches back to the interest of the people of this country, in the productivity of this country, yes, in the future of this country. True, a man cannot go out and spend money on his own land without improving that which he holds, but the folks dependent upon his production, are you and I and others in our cities and elsewhere, and all over this country. The ones dependent upon what kind of shape we leave this country in are those generations who will follow us.

In the last 10 years the population of this country increased by 19,000,000. This country has existed for 175 years. In history, what is that in the history of the Chinese people. What is 175 years in the history of the Italian people? It is only a moment. If we have wasted this great country of ours to the extent we have in that short period, what can we look to in the future if we keep it up, if our population keeps climbing at the rate of nineteen to twenty million every 10 years? This is a more serious matter than many of you think.

I grant you that many people will carry on soil conservation for 2 or 3 years, but the generating force that has been behind the efforts of private individuals, the thing that has caused lots of people to bring about soil conservation on their own farms at their own cost, has been the fact that you have had some agency pushing and pressing for it.

I happen to have a farm but I never drew a dime out of this production payment contribution in my life. Perhaps it is because I knew I was going to be up here and I did not want to be vulnerable, but I want to be honest about it, I have not done one-tenth of the soil conservation I should have done, either.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. I think the gentleman is right in pointing out the fact that we have had an increase in this country. I think the statistics are that in the past 37 years we have gone from 100,000,000 to 151,000,000. That is an increase of over 50 percent in the population in less than 40 years time.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman is correct and I thank him for his contribution. We have our high standard of living because it takes mighty few of us to grow the food and fiber for the rest of us, leaving great numbers of our people to supply the automobiles, refrigerators, radios, and the thousands and one things we enjoy beyond that of any other country in the world. But you let the soil fertility go down and you are bound eventually to have conditions such that a bigger and bigger percentage of your people have to till the soil to provide the food and fiber for the rest of them. This is not a 5- or 10-year period we are talking about. The very future of our children is involved.

There is not a man within the sound of my voice that is more disturbed about the financial structure of this country than I am, but it is a financial structure. May the day never come when we have to wipe it out and start all over again, but if we have to wipe out the financial structure of this country, bad as it would be, as long as we have the soil and the natural resources and the ability to produce, it is not going to wreck us if we have to change the medium of exchange. It is the country that lets the soil go down that gets itself into the fix of Italy, France in some places, China, Greece, and India, where the medium of exchange will not work because there is too little production to exchange.

Do not let that happen to us in this country. Let us have vision. Let us have confidence enough in our future to recognize that if we are ever going to get out from under a $270,000,000,000 debt it is going to be because of our ability to produce.

In this program we are not giving the farmer anything but we are urging him to protect that soil fertility. If he will spend $3 the Federal Government will spend $1 so that our soil will be kept for future generations.

Through the Marshall plan we have put up the money to require these depleted countries to spend, in counterpart funds many times the amounts in this bill, to restore the natural resources of those countries. We required them to do that because their recovery must be based on their productivity.

Let us not gradually destroy our own country by taking out more than we put back in when we reach the place those countries are now in, there will likely be no nation like the United States with its Marshall plan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the Chair was in doubt.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WHITTEN and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided; and tellers reported there were—ayes 120, noes 142.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution favoring an embargo by the United Nations on shipments of war materials to Communist China.

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—ACQUISITION AND DISPOSITION OF LAND BY THE ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, ETC. (H. DOC. NO. 133)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 3096, a bill "relating to the acquisition and disposition of land and interests in land by the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Federal Civil Defense Administration."

This bill would impose certain restrictions on the real estate transactions of the military departments and of Federal Civil Defense Administration. In general, it would require those agencies to come into agreement with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives with respect to the acquisition or disposal of real property, including leases involving an annual rental in excess of $10,000, and including transfers of real property between the military departments or to other Federal agencies, or to States, with certain minor exceptions. A recital of compliance with the Act in an instrument of conveyance, including a lease, or a recital that the conveyance or lease is not affected by the act would be conclusive evidence of the fact so recited. The bill would also repeal section 407 of Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress, which requires the authority of an act of Congress enacted subsequent thereto in order for a military department generally to dispose of real property. It would also repeal a proviso contained in the Act of April 4, 1944, requiring the Secretary of the Navy to come into agreement with congressional committees prior to the acquisition or disposition by the Department of the Navy of any land acquired for naval use.

On January 15, 1951, I sent a message to the Congress urging that it repeal section 407 at its earliest opportunity. In that message I stated that that section, if permitted to stand, may seriously impede our mobilization effort by causing unnecessary and unwarranted delays in the transfer for other governmental uses of property excess to the needs of the military departments.

While H. R. 3096 would effect the repeal of section 407 of Public Law 910, it would subject to the decision of congressional committees, not only those transactions that are covered by section 407

Thornberry	Watts	Wilson, Ind.
Tollefson	Weichel	Wilson, Tex.
Towe	Werdel	Winstead
Vail	Wharton	Withrow
Van Pelt	Wheeler	Wolcott
Van Zandt	Whitten	Wolverton
Vaughn	Wickersham	Wood, Ga.
Velde	Widnall	Wood, Idaho
Vinson	Wigglesworth	Woodruff
Vorys	Williams, Miss.	Yorty
Vursell	Williams, N. Y.	
Walter	Willis	

NAYS—68

Addonizio	Holifield	O'Brien, Ill.
Anfuso	Howell	O'Brien, Mich.
Bates, Ky.	Javits	O'Neill
Bolling	Jones, Mo.	O'Toole
Burnside	Karsten, Mo.	Patman
Cannon	Kelley, Pa.	Priest
Carnahan	Kelly, N. Y.	Rabaut
Celler	Kennedy	Ramsay
Crosser	Keogh	Rhodes
Dawson	King	Rodino
Denton	Klein	Rooney
Dollinger	Kluczynski	Roosevelt
Eberharter	Lesinski	Sieminski
Fernandez	McCarthy	Spence
Fine	McCormack	Staggers
Flood	McGuire	Tackett
Fogarty	Machrowicz	Trimble
Forand	Mack, Ill.	Welch
Gordon	Madden	Whitaker
Granger	Mitchell	Wier
Hart	Moulder	Yates
Hedrick	Multer	Zablocki
Heller	Murdock	

NOT VOTING—52

Adair	Deane	Latham
Angell	Dingell	Lyle
Bailey	Dorn	McGrath
Baker	Ellsworth	Magee
Barrett	Gillette	Miller, Calif.
Beamer	Granahan	Miller, N. Y.
Blatnik	Green	Morgan
Bonner	Hall,	Murray, Wis.
Bosone	Leonard W.	Perkins
Bray	Halleck	Poage
Brooks	Harvey	Powell
Brownson	Hays, Ark.	Redden
Buckley	Irving	Richards
Butler	Jackson, Wash.	Roberts
Byrne, N. Y.	Judd	Rogers, Tex.
Chudoff	Kersten, Wis.	Sabath
Colmer	Kilday	Sheppard
Crumpacker	Kirwan	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Colmer and Mr. Roberts for, with Mr. Barrett against.

Mr. Halleck and Mr. Adair for, with Mr. Granahan against.

Mr. Leonard W. Hall and Mr. Beamer for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Bray and Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Irving against.

Mr. Crumpacker and Mr. Baker for, with Mr. Chudoff against.

Mr. Miller of New York and Mr. Latham for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Gillette and Mr. Butler for, with Mr. Blatnik against.

Mr. Brownson and Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. Byrne of New York against.

Mr. Redden and Mr. Dorn for, with Mr. McGrath against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bailey with Mr. Angell.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Deane with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.

Mr. Perkins with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3973, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Tuesday, May 15, the Clerk had read down to and including line 25 on page 34 of the bill.

Are there any amendments to be offered at this point?

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ABBITT: On page 33, line 11, strike out "$2,500" and insert "$1,000."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, it is our hope that we can complete the consideration of this bill this afternoon and that we can proceed promptly and tend to the business at hand. I hope we can confine our remarks entirely to the bill, so that we can get done with it.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, at the outset, I want to say this amendment does not in any way reduce the amount of the appropriation for the ACP funds. That was disposed of Tuesday. The purpose of the amendment is, however, to reduce the amount that any one participant might receive under the program. In 1947 the limitation was $10,000. In 1948 it was cut to $500, and in 1949, $750. In 1947, my information is that 80 percent of the participants got 40 percent of the money and 20 percent of the participants received 60 percent of the money. It seems to me we are all agreed the purpose of this program is to preserve the fertility of our soil and to conserve our natural resources. They are incentive payments—payments so that our people will hand this land on down to future generations. The amendment does not cut anybody out. It only limits one participant to $1,000. That seems to me to be a fair and just limitation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wish to assure the gentleman that as far as the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] and I are concerned, we are glad to agree to his amendment and I hope the amendment prevails.

Mr. ABBITT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I was very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman that the purpose of the soil-conservation program is to preserve the land and build up the fertility of the land and protect its productivity over the years. If that is the purpose of the program, do you not think that you will be handicapping the program by restricting the land on which the program will be applied?

Mr. ABBITT. This does not restrict the land whatever. It only restricts the amount of money which the large landowners and the large corporations can receive. They are in a position to carry out these land practices. In my opinion, the ones we want to help are the family farm owners and those who are not able to carry on unless they have some help from our Government. We do not want to unnecessarily pay out money to the people who are going to do this anyhow. It is an educational program, as I understand it, to help people who need the help. The large landowners who draw from $1,000 to $2,500 do not need that extra money to carry out the proper conservation practices.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I think the gentleman has a basic misconception of what the program is. It is not a program to provide relief for farmers, but to provide for soil-conservation practices for the greatest amount of land in the country possible. Do you not think that the whole idea of the program is to provide benefits for the land instead of for the farmers?

Mr. ABBITT. That is what I have been saying.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I am glad the gentleman has offered the amendment and I shall support it. In the discussion the other day great emphasis was laid on the fact that this was a program for the smaller farmer. Four years ago—I have no more recent figures, although perhaps the committee has—80 percent of these payees got less than $100; 65 percent of them got less than $60. I thought we should go under $1,000, but I am glad to withhold my amendment and will support the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT] has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas to the amendment offered by Mr. ABBITT: Strike out "$1,000" and insert "$750."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment reduces the maximum payment to individuals from $2,500 to $750 under the Production and Marketing Administration.

Assuming the appropriation of $225,000,000 is not reduced, the funds saved by this amendment will be divided among those who get the smaller payments. If you adopt my amendment, those presently getting $2,500 and less down to $750 will still get $750 each. In doing so, you can save about $25,000,000 unless, of course, larger payments are made to smaller participants.

I agree with the gentleman from Virginia who offered the amendment to provide a maximum of $1,000, that more can be accomplished in the conservation of the soil by being more liberal with those who receive smaller payments than to give so much of this money to

the big operators. It should be observed this is separate from the big soil-conservation program for which funds are appropriated to the extent of two or three hundred million dollars a year for the employment of engineers and others who provide coordinated plans and give technical advice for conservation of land and crops. That conservation program has accomplished a great deal of good for this country. As above stated, it is separate from the program under consideration, except a part of these funds may be used in carrying out a part of the soil-conservation program.

Mr. Chairman, in these days when there is demand for saving taxpayers' money, it seems to me that those who get the larger payments from the Government for improving their own farms, ought to be willing to reduce the contribution from the Government to $750, rather than ask the Government to pay them $2,500 for doing the thing they ought to do on their own land. I remind you the maximum was $750 for a period of 2 years. There was no complaint from the average farmer.

This appropriation is for $225,000,000. Under this bill, 3.4 percent of the payees will receive $40,000,000. Think that over and see where the big share of this money is spent.

This is the way it worked last year. Out of $255,000,000, 40,000 payees got $38,500,000, which means that 1.3 percent of all of the payees got 15 percent of the money.

There were 3,097,000 participants in this program in 1950. They received an average of approximately $82. Now listen to this. Out of 3,097,000 people who received $255,000,000 last year, 560,000 received less than $20. More than one-sixth of the whole 3,000,000 people got from $1 to $20 each. How much soil conservation could $3,000,000 farmers do who received less than $20 each? Explain that if you will.

It is clear to see that the great majority of the farmers of this country did not get very much out of this program. As a matter of fact, 55.7 percent, more than half of them, got from $1 to $60, no more than $60, and yet these people who oppose this amendment would have you think that you are treating a great majority of the farmers of this country with great benevolence. I wish the farmers could know just how you are handling this thing.

One more thing. The group who get $500 or more are only 2 percent in number of those who participate. Think of it; only 2 out of every 100 get $500 or more, but they get a total of approximately $45,000,000, which again is about 20 percent of the entire $225,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, if you do not want to save approximately $25,000,000 and put it back into the Treasury, you can, without reducing the appropriation, pay it to more than 2,000,000 participants who will get less than $60 apiece. Let me repeat, under the bill, unless you adopt this amendment, you are going to pay $45,000,000 to only 15 percent of those who participate in the program. On the other hand, you are going to pay 2,385,000 farmers, or 77 percent of those who participate, less than $100 each, and yet those who oppose my amendment will shout to the housetops and say that I am by this amendment sniping at a bill because they want to pay $2,500 apiece to a number of big landowners and plantation operators, rather than pay it to the little fellow who only gets $40 or $50. He is told by this committee in doing so that the Government is particularly benevolent to him. He would not think so if he knew the facts.

Mr. Chairman, if you want to pay any funds from the Federal Government to help the farmer, then you better allocate it to the independent operator who will use it to some advantage, and not dish out as much as $40,000,000 to about 3 percent of those who participate in the farm program.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, who is a participant and who is familiar with this problem and knows a great deal about it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman. I did not know at the time the Abbitt amendment with $1,000 was offered that the gentleman from Kansas intended to offer one for $750. Personally, I will support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's support.

In order that the membership of the House may know how expenditures were made in 1950, I am including herewith a statement in round figures that I secured from the Department of Agriculture showing how PMA funds were distributed last year:

Payments	Payees	Amount paid
$1,000 to $2,500	10,000	[1] $16,818,000
$500 to $1,000	30,000	[2] 21,626,000
$400 to $500	25,000	[3] 10,813,000
$300 to $400	40,000	[4] 13,455,000
$200 to $300	92,000	22,126,000
$150 to $200	165,000	27,756,000
$100 to $150	350,000	42,057,000
$60 to $100	660,000	50,728,000
$40 to $60	525,000	25,228,000
$20 to $40	640,000	18,462,000
$1 to $20	560,000	5,931,000
Total	3,097,000	255,000,000

[1] 6.6 percent.
[2] 8½ percent.
[3] 4.2 percent.
[4] 5.3 percent.

I think anyone who is willing to examine these figures will understand that irrespective of the orations that are being delivered by those who oppose my amendment, that although they are spending $225,000,000 from the Federal Treasury, they are not passing very much of it on to the man who operates what may be described as the family-sized farm.

Please take a look at the table. How much soil conservation can 560,000 farmers do when each of them gets less than $20. Look again. Six hundred and forty thousand others will get from $20 to $40 each. So, 1,200,000 farmers out of 3,000,000 will receive less than $40. I think it is clear to those willing to examine this table that you pay $55,000,000 to 65,000 payees, and then you try to satisfy a million and a half farmers by dividing $55,000,000 among them. It hardly seems fair, does it?

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if this program were a handout to farmers I would be opposed to it. We are thinking in terms of conservation of our soil and whether we conserve the soil on the hills, the slopes, the plains, or elsewhere, it is conservation of the soil that we need and that we must have.

There are some faults with this program; all of us who are familiar with farming know that there are some faults with this program. We know there are some things that ought to be done to make this program better. Some of the practices that are the most needed for the conservation of our soil are not on large farms, as the debate seems to be directed to, but are on small farms. Practices may require a large expenditure in a year. I am thinking about those funds that are needed for such things as gully control and terracing which require mechanical tools to correct.

This program has a weakness, that it is set up on an annual basis. Perhaps some of the objection to this program could be overcome in connection with the payment for these practices if it extended over a longer period of years so that the farmers could make arrangements to pay for the improvement over a longer period of years. When he hires machinery to come in and stop erosion and fix up his gullies a tremendous burden of expense is placed upon him in one year which you cannot pay with a $750 or $1,000 limitation. That is a permanent improvement; that is something that stays there. The putting in of sod waterways, the putting in of dams, the putting in of anything that requires construction takes more than $500 or $750, or even more than $1,000 on small farms, and my district is made up of small farms. We are thinking in terms of things which must be done as far as permanent improvements are concerned.

If you want to fritter money away and get but little out of it, cut this program down to where it is a matter of handing out a subsidy to the farmers.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman realizes that in his own State 80 percent of those who participate get less than $100.

Mr. MARSHALL. Certainly I realize that. We are thinking in terms of soil conservation. When we think in terms of soil conservation a different picture is presented to us, and the sooner we realize that the sooner we recognize one of the problems that face us in this country. We keep hammering on the thought that we are talking in terms of a small payment or a handout to a farmer, and then immediately we begin to think in terms of subsidies. Let us start thinking about conserving the soil. That is the purpose of this program. In the gentleman's own State he must know of a good many

practices which require an outlay of a considerable amount of money.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman knows that in his State and in my State you cannot do much soil-conservation work with $40 or $20 or $10.

Mr. MARSHALL. Of course not. I realize that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Would it not be a whole lot better, to take the gentleman's version of it, and put in a provision for $750 and if the Soil Conservation Service wants to use the money for the little fellow, all right. You cannot do much when you have only $75 or $80 toward conserving your farm.

Mr. MARSHALL. The gentleman talks with some wisdom and it is too bad that his foresight is not greater and that he cannot visualize and see what is happening in his own district. If he would think about the matter in terms of a permanent improvement, and I think he is interested in permanent improvements——

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is right.

Mr. MARSHALL. The gentleman is not interested in any stopgap measure.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want the farmers to make the improvements themselves.

Mr. MARSHALL. That is the purpose of this program. It is a program that will enable the farmer to carry on practices that will help solve the problem, but the gentleman is limiting the expenditure of the funds with his amendment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. To $750.

Mr. MARSHALL. Let me answer the gentleman's question. It will be helpful to me and I am sure it will be helpful to him. When you start to cut down the amount of expenditure that can be made in any one year, we will cause the larger proportion of this fund to go into practices that are not of a permanent nature, which he and I criticize. I am sure the gentleman must realize that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the amendments which the distinguished gentleman from Virginia and his colleague from Kansas have offered to this bill, it seems to me, serve a purpose entirely different from their professed belief in what the Government program should do. This is not a WPA handout, it is not a subsidy for the farmers, it is not a bonus that the farmers get, it is not a matter of trying to distribute to the most people in order to get the most votes.

The purpose of these soil conservation payments is to provide an incentive by which the greatest number of acres in the country can be utilized by good conservation practices so that they will be preserved and used in the future where the richness of the soil may continue to contribute to the richness of the country.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. As a matter of fact, the farmer himself puts up from $2 to $3 for every $1 that the Government matches?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Of course. In connection with these payments that come up to $2,500 it means expenditures will be made of from five to ten thousand dollars for conservation purposes upon some farm during the year in which the money is paid out. As the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] mentioned in his able presentation of this matter, there are many of the most vital soil conservation projects which involve a large expenditure of money. It is too bad they are restricted to a 1-year period so far as incentive is concerned. When you attempt to control gulleys, when you attempt to control sheet erosion, you cannot go out and just put up a fence, dig a ditch or something like that. It involves an engineering program that must mean something for the entire community or a large segment of acreage or a large portion of a farm. I think this Congress would be resorting to WPA boondoggling tactics if it subsidized to buy votes by cutting the limitation on what soil conservation payments can be made so they will be distributed to the largest number of farmers. Why can we not change the amendment and provide that every farmer get $25, if you want to give the most payments to the most farmers? We are trying to build up these conservation practices, not pass out the most money to the largest number of farmers.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I can understand that the gentleman may have big operators in his State, such as plantation owners, who would get these large payments; but it seems to me that as between the two, the large plantation owner, the big operator, would be glad and willing and does to a great degree take care of the things which the gentleman is talking about. On the other hand, you are appropriating two-hundred-and-some-odd-million dollars, would it not be better for the country at large to divide this fund and give a little more of it to the small operator who only has a small acreage rather than give a large amount of it, as was just suggested here, something like 15 or 16 percent of all this money, to only 1½ percent of the operators?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The program that the gentleman seems to suggest, it seems to me, as only a logical conclusion, would be to take this money and divide it on a head basis among all the farmers of the country. In that way you would reach the largest number of farmers. What I am trying to do in my opposition to this amendment is to attempt to get soil conservation practices established on the largest number of acres in this country.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. The table that the gentleman from Kansas is quoting in connection with the size of the payments had nothing whatsoever to do with the size of the farm. There is nothing in there about the acreage of the farm. That is payment to each farm on the basis of practices that they carry out, as a matter of digging ditches, as a matter of terracing, and doing that sort of thing, and a 40-acre farm or 80-acre farm may require a large expenditure in one year. But, when the job is done, it is done, so this program and this limitation that the gentleman from Kansas is talking about is of real assistance to the small farmer when he can use in a year $2,500, but you correct some of these practices so far as the things that are destroying his soil are concerned.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The gentleman is right. In my experience I can mention payments to operators of large plantations, 4,000 and 5,000 acres, who get only $40 or $50 a year out of this program, and that is because they have only indulged in conservation practices to that extent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does not the gentleman think under the circumstances, and considering the terrific expenses by the Government, and considering that the large landowners are doing pretty well, that they would not expect the Government to help them to the extent of $2,500 on a thing of this?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The gentleman is still completely confused. This is not an effort to help the large landowners. This is an effort to not only help to to improve our land, but to save it for generations to come. Some of the biggest payments made in my State have been made to small landowners in badly eroded hill country, in taking steps to preserve a 40- or 100-acre farm and to restore it to production and keep it in production for years to come. This is not an effort for anything in behalf of the large landowners; it is in behalf of the land of the United States. I appeal to the House to consider this when they vote. If you vote to cut down these payments you are actually voting for Government subsidy to farmers on a head basis. If you vote for the soil-conservation program for the future, you will do something about making these pay-

ments applicable on a large scale to whatever conservation practices seem most applicable to the land concerned.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have never understood that this PMA program was only in the interest of the small operator. I have regarded it and I believe that everybody else has regarded it as a program which is in the interest of the general welfare of all the people of America. The program contemplates the protection of all of the farms and ranch lands of this great country, the idea being that we will preserve the Nation's richest resource, the fertile top soil of the farms and ranches of this Republic. If the authors of these amendments have a different idea about the program, they certainly have not made their views very clear to the Members of the House.

If the program is restricted further, then you can visualize a farmer who operates his farm through tenants. He might be eliminated from the program. The tenants will not participate. The soil will not be protected. The fertility of the soil will be wasted, and we will defeat the very purposes of the program.

Actually, I come from a part of the country where we have numerous little farms. If you look at the $2,500 limitation, you must realize that all of the people we refer to as big operators have already been eliminated from the program. I have never regarded this as a Government hand-out. I regard it as an investment in a national resource of vital importance to the people of this country.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The so-called big operator to whom the gentleman just referred has been limited by virtue of the fact there is already a limit of $2,500 on these payments.

Mr. COOLEY. The effect of that has been to eliminate the big operator, the big corporation, to whom the gentleman has referred. Actually, I have probably less at stake in this amendment than any man here, because I come from an area where we have a lot of small farms. I dare say it would not very adversely affect the people of my district. But out in your country, out in the great, wide open spaces of America, it will affect the landowners and not only the landowners but the tenants.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If you do not reduce the appropriation from what you have here, the committee has reduced it from last year, so we are going to have less money. The people in the gentleman's State get an average of less than $60 per payment, do they not?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If you are going to use the $225,000,000 that you are appropriating——

Mr. COOLEY. It leaves more money for my part of the country.

Mr. REES of Kansas. For the smaller operators.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. So I say I have less right to complain about it than anybody. But I do not regard these things from a sectional standpoint or as limited to my own district or my own county. I think you are going to cripple this program. As I said here the other day, I do not think any mathematician or economist connected with any department of the Government can evaluate this program if we look down through the future for a thousand years.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If the gentleman is right about that, he ought to increase this appropriation, and make it twice as much.

Mr. COOLEY. I was perfectly willing to increase the appropriation. The gentleman is not telling me anything. I voted for it when it was over a half a billion dollars a year and never had cause to regret it. I remember that the gentleman, although he is a great friend of agriculture, seems to be dissatisfied with every bill that is brought out here that attempts to provide some relief for agricultural people.

Mr. REES of Kansas. There is no sniping at all.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman comes now with an amendment to cut it down to $750.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am for the little fellow, not the big man.

Mr. COOLEY. All right. We are all for the little man. But what is going to happen to the little tenants on the farms down in North Carolina and the farms in Mississippi and the farms in the gentleman's district?

Mr. REES of Kansas. He will get more money under my amendment than he will under the gentleman's proposal.

Mr. COOLEY. His landlord will say, "No, we are not interested in this program and we will not build up the soil because we will not benefit by the program."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Is it not true that the adoption of the pending amendment, which is perhaps designed to restrict the large operator, will actually hurt the small tenant and the small operator, because so much of the land in this country is owned by people who operate on a relatively large basis as compared to certain other areas; so while the amendment is no doubt offered to restrict the large operator, in operation it would hurt not so much the large operator in the long run as it would hurt the soil-conservation program as a whole and hurt the little tenant?

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is probably right.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time so that I may inquire of the majority leader as to the program for the balance of the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. In the event the pending bill is disposed of and the final vote taken today, it is my intention to ask unanimous consent that the House go over until Monday, there being no business tomorrow.

Mr. KILBURN. I object.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW].

(Mr. WITHROW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in soil conservation. I have many soil-conservation projects in my district and I certainly do not want to see the large operator get more than his fair share of the money that we appropriate for this program. I do, however, want the program to be successful. I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia who proposed the amendment limiting individual payments to $1,000, and likewise the gentleman from Kansas, who lowered that to $750, if they are not making somewhat of a mistake and doing a grave injustice in certain cases.

In my particular congressional district there are valleys in which there are 12, 14, or more farms, and there are unquestionably innumerable congressional districts throughout the United States that have the same or similar characteristics. At the head, or nearly at the head of these valleys there is one spot which, if it is taken care of properly, would conserve the soil of the entire valley. By the limitation of $1,000 you will be doing a grave injustice to the man on whose farm the project is located, because you would make him expend a great deal more money than $1,000, when, as a matter of fact, that soil-conservation practice at that particular spot would affect the entire valley. Does the gentleman from Kansas not see the injustice of that sort of situation? How can you place a limitation of that kind and be realistic about it when there are perhaps 12 or 15 farms in the valley where near the head of the valley there is one farm upon which, if you installed an earth dam or other soil-conservation practice, you could probably eliminate almost entirely the destruction of the soil in the entire valley. The limitation of $750 as proposed by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] would endanger, if not make ineffective, practical soil conservation in my congressional district.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not know how well informed the gentleman is with respect to farm operations, but I take it he is well informed and understands the problem and knows about the problem of his own experience. At least I hope the gentleman does.

In the first place there is nothing at all to prevent these 14 farms that you speak of from going ahead and trying

out a program if they want to work together on any program. If the 14 or so farms want to do soil-conservation work of course they would be entitled to the limit of $750 each. But the gentleman does not know of a single farm in his own district, and he cannot name a single farm of average size which, under the program, with all the practices that he can put into effect on an average farm, who gets $750. The gentleman could not point out such a farm in his own State. As a matter of fact $750 would be higher than the average, because the average receives less than $750 in his State. If you want to be realistic about the thing you will find in your own district, and I have the figures here, that you have hardly anybody receiving that much. You talk about these 14 or so farms. If they all want to work together, they can get $500 or $750 apiece and comply with the program and do the necessary work.

I am looking at this in a realistic manner, as the gentleman is.

Mr. WITHROW. I would like to know from someone aside from the gentleman from Kansas whether or not it is possible under this program for say 12 or 15 farmers to get together on a program and get $750 each under the provisions of the present soil-conservation act.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Provided they qualify.

Mr. WITHROW. Provided they qualify. Yes, indeed. But why place this limitation of $750? You already have a limitation of $2,500, which keeps the big fellow out of this. There is a limitation upon him. Why not let us go ahead with the program where we need help that will be constructive? Not only that, you say right now there are not any projects in my district that would cost more than $750.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 1 minute of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WITHROW. In my district there are any number of projects that are under contemplation at this time, that would cost considerably more than $750. Under this amendment you would place a limitation upon them, which would make it impossible to go ahead with the projects.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WITHROW. I do not yield.

To my mind, it would be most unwise to adopt either of these two limitations. To argue that they should be adopted under the guise of attempting to economize is an absurdity. We all know that if the program is to be a success it must actually conserve the soil. The proposed limitations would merely handicap the program and would, in my opinion, doom it to almost sure failure. We all seem to be quite in agreement that our soil must be conserved. Therefore, permit the people who are actually engaged in the soil-conservation program to operate unhampered by limitations of this kind.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. If it is a fact that the gentleman does not have a farm in his district that would be affected by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas, I think it speaks well for the gentleman from Wisconsin to oppose the amendment, which shows that he is looking at it from an over-all standpoint.

Mr. WITHROW. I thank the gentleman.

I sincerely hope that these two limitation amendments will be promptly voted down by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] is recognized.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I agree wholeheartedly in the very fine remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], my good chairman the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW], and others who have spoken in opposition to these amendments.

When this soil-conservation program was first inaugurated, there was no limitation whatever. Later on, a limitation of $10,000 was applied. Then, in the second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, Mr. Jones, who was chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, brought in what was known as H. R. 3800, which would have reduced soil-conservation payments to $5,000. That bill was not enacted into law although the House Committee on Agriculture approved it. The $10,000 limitation remained in effect until the Eightieth Congress, when it was reduced to $750. The Eighty-first Congress put into effect the $2,500 limitation, which is on the statute books today.

We have had these arguments ever since I have been in Congress. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has come in here repeatedly. One year he offered an amendment to make the limitation $250. The House of course did not look with favor upon such an amendment. We cannot conserve the soil of America by limiting these payments to $750 or $1,000. One of the greatest arguments I ever heard about the value of soil conservation was made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] before the Committee on Agriculture. He emphasized the point that the topsoil is the most valuable asset America has. The proper minerals and salts in the soil is a prerequisite to the production of good food to go on the tables of the American people.

I want to commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], our Agriculture Committee chairman, for bringing out a most important feature of the whole matter. A similar comment was made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. That is this, that a large farm is nothing but an aggregation of several small farms; and until the landowner comes into the program you are denying the share tenants a chance to participate in this program; he is out completely because of the fact that he cannot come in by himself; the landowner has to sign up for these benefits.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman does not say, though, that the income is anything like equitably distributed giving those very small people a fair advantage.

Mr. GATHINGS. I do not believe in the philosophy to start with that we should limit payments just because a man has saved his money and acquired a little piece of land, farms it successfully, and buys additional acreage. I do not believe in cutting the benefits to which he is entitled under the conservation program just because he has been thrifty. I believe in the American system.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Does the gentleman believe in the philosophy of giving one small farmer, we will say, an acre allotment or a 2-acre allotment?

Mr. GATHINGS. Now, we are not going to get into a discussion of that.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Does the gentleman believe in this philosophy?

Mr. GATHINGS. Unless the owner comes into the program, under the law, the tenant cannot participate in the program.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Does the gentleman believe in that philosophy?

Mr. GATHINGS. I do not yield further because we are not dealing with cotton allotments.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Of course not; we are talking about the philosophy of fairness.

Mr. GATHINGS. My philosophy is the American philosophy that a man has the right to go out, earn, and increase his holdings.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Tell the House how you feel about the question.

Mr. GATHINGS. I did not yield further to the gentleman. I hope that the amendments will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] is recognized.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, let us bear in mind that we are talking about two different programs in some instances. The Soil Conservation Service is an entirely different program from that of the Production Marketing Administration.

This limitation is a limitation on the funds to be spent by the Production Marketing Administration and it has nothing to do with the building up of terraces or contouring your hillsides; that is under the Soil Conservation Service. Of course, PMA funds are largely spent for soil-conserving practices.

The second point is, and this is important to keep in mind, that the State committee allots so much money per county and all the money is going to be spent; in fact, they nearly always run out of money in my county. And whether you take care of the big farmers or the small farmers, this money is going

to be spent, all of it is going to be spent and that will happen whether this limitation is put into the bill or not. If the limitation is put into the bill it is going to be spent where it is needed most and be given to men who are entitled to it most and its benefits will be put on soils that need conservation most, and those, by and large, are the holdings of the small farmers, not the 5,000-acre farms, and the large ranches.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. MARSHALL. I wish to call attention to the fact that this program goes right hand in hand with the soil-conservation program. The Soil Conservation Service program has done an excellent job in their planning; however, the farmer to put those practices into effect must have some means of doing it. That is the program I am talking about, and I am sure the gentleman agrees with me. We are thinking in terms of getting as many permanent improvement practices put into effect as we can.

Mr. GOSSETT. That is right.

Mr. MARSHALL. Therefore, if PMA funds can be used and directed toward such construction that, I think, would be a good answer.

Mr. GOSSETT. I think we probably agree on what we want done. We want to give the the greatest improvement to the most acres, but the gentleman and I, I believe, would do it by different methods. Under my plan it would be spread to more individuals on more farms and would be used in a way and in places where it is most needed and would do the most good. The man who has a 2,000-, a 5,000-, or a 10,000-acre ranch is not in as much need of it as 10 farmers who have small holdings. It is a subsidy that the Government is giving to encourage conservation practices. The more people who can be encouraged under the program, the better.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I want to commend the gentleman on the incessant effort he has made as a Member of Congress to do something about this very important problem. Unquestionably one of the most unjustifiable results that has obtained, perhaps not purposely, in the administration of the agricultural programs has been that too much goes to too few and too many got far too little from the various programs.

Mr. GOSSETT. That is substantially correct.

Mr. BECKWORTH. As I stated a moment ago, in the district I represent, and I have a letter that came just a few days ago to that effect, we have people who were allotted cotton acreage of one and two and three acres. In some instances, in one particularly, some 400 people in one county got no acreage at all. The pattern of what I am describing here is to be found in some soil conservation activities. Some small farmers benefit little. One of the ways to help bring about equity and justice in this program is to do what our distinguished and very reasonable colleague from Texas has sought to do almost from the time he came to the Congress.

Mr. GOSSETT. Let me say to the gentleman that I am not criticizing my able colleagues who represent their districts well, but most of those who are fighting this amendment the hardest come from the big farming areas. This amendment is simply an effort to distribute money more equitably and where it will do the most good. It is the small farms mostly that are being washed away.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I want to congratulate the gentleman on being consistent at least and I want to point out the fact that while he is willing to reduce this amount he actually about 2 days ago wanted to cut the whole thing to the core, cut out about $75,000,000.

Mr. GOSSETT. I wanted to reduce PMA funds by $75,000,000 to help cut down our perilous deficit. That lacks a lot of being to the core.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is at least consistent.

Mr. GOSSETT. I thank the gentleman. I try to be. If there is such a thing as a farm bloc, Mr. Chairman, I am a member of such bloc. However, farmers are interested in a more efficient program and in saving public money.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

(Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, the issue here has been pretty well defined. That issue is whether or not this is a program for giving hand-outs to farmers or a program to conserve the soil. That is all there is to it. The theory of the proponents of these amendments seems to be that if the size of the payments is limited more people will get them. On the other hand, an acre of soil on a large farm can erode just as easily as an acre of soil on a small farm and it will cost just as much to put it back into condition.

The gentleman from Texas has referred to the fact that there is a difference between the Soil Conservation Service program and the program providing for soil conservation payments. That is true but, as everyone knows, just recently the Secretary of Agriculture has issued an order which consolidates those programs at the local level and to a very large extent at the higher levels. From now on those two programs will be coordinated as they should be. As a matter of fact the two programs have gradually been meshed together during the past few years with the result that more and more the soil conservation payment program has become more of a program for carrying out the physical treatment of the soil, such as building of dams and terraces and that sort of thing. In other words the work has taken on a more permanent character year after year.

The more we can change this into that kind of a program, the more conservation we are going to get. That should be the ultimate objective and aim of the program and it is working in that direction more and more all the time. If, however, payments are limited too severely the amount of substantial conservation which may be accomplished is bound to be limited.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Am I incorrect in this? It has always been my impression that soil-conservation payments were made on the basis of what was earned in conserving the soil, whether it be 5 acres, 100 acres, or 1,000 acres. Am I wrong about that impression?

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman is correct, and I am glad he mentioned it, because it gives me a chance to point out again that it is not a matter of acreage or the size of the farm which determines how much a man earns in the way of payments. It is the practices which he carries out which determine that question. A small farm can very easily earn a larger payment than a large farm, depending upon the practices which are carried out.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW] in his excellent discussion made a most significant statement when he pointed out that in a given area, the whole key to soil conservation may depend on the treatment that is given on one farm, and no one can earn the payment of that farm except the man who owns and operates that farm. If he is limited in the funds he can earn, it means that the whole project may fail. To adopt either the Abbitt amendment or the Rees amendment would be a backward step and a blow to the progress of soil conservation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time, not intending to use it all, but primarily to address a couple of inquiries to the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Kansas with reference to their amendments. It has been said here, and very properly so, that we should not consider this matter on a sectional basis but should look at it from the point of view of the entire country. Certainly one of the factors, if we are going to do that, which we must consider, is the amount involved for the taxpayers in these two amendments. All the talk here has been about how the farmers in this, that or the other section of the country are affected by this legislation. That is, of course, an appropriate subject of inquiry. But we must not forget that those same farmers as well as the wage earners and nearly everyone else is also affected from the point of view of footing the bill to pay for the expenditures we approve, therefore, highly important to determine whether there will be any actual money saved over-all by the adoption of either one of these amendments.

The gentleman from Kansas cited some figures, and I would like verification either from him or the gentleman from Virginia. If I understand it correctly, provided the maximum payment which can be made to any one participant is reduced from $2,500 to $1,000, it should effect a saving of somewhere around $16,000,000 over-all. Am I correct about that?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. And the gentleman from Virginia agrees with the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. ABBITT. No, I did not say anything about the savings to the taxpayers. What I have in mind is that the committee has cut the appropriation from what it was last year, and that has been upheld by this body. There is less money this year than what we have now, and my idea is that it will go around to help more if not too much money is given the large operators, for this reason: The man who is going into a large operation has sufficient assets, in my opinion, to carry it out anyway, and when we cut these small farmers, then we are really cutting conservation, in my opinion, and that was the thing I had in mind, making the payment up to $1,000, and the rest he has to carry on himself. The vast majority of these people are engaged in small practices, and I am afraid that they will stop entirely these practices.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, just following the gentleman from Virginia, if this is cut to $750—and I realize there is not so much difference in the amount of the payment—there would be approximately $28,000,000 available, and for that reason you would have, unless you are going to reduce this appropriation, that much more money to provide among these small operators.

Mr. ABBITT. That is what I had in mind.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Let me say this, and it has been referred to here by at least two Members that regard this as a handout. It is no handout at all. It is a question of viewpoint with regard to the way you use the money. But it is money paid to the individual for doing work on his own land. This partly reimburses him for the service he renders to the country, if you want to put it that way, for conserving the soil. But it is money paid out of the Federal Treasury to the individual. It is not a handout or anything of the kind. Get that off your mind.

May I say to the gentleman that the payment has been as low as $750. It was that for 2 years. It has been as low as $500. So this is not an innovation of any kind.

May I say further that it is not the intent to snipe at this bill at all. If you do not want to take these amendments, that is well and good, but let us not call it sniping. It does not sound well, and does not go well with someone who is interested in these matters.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, at the time the gentleman from Virginia was recognized I was seeking recognition to offer an amendment to reduce the over-all figure available for the Production and Marketing Administration program from $225,000,000 to $200,000,000. I realize there were a number here before who voted against the more serious or drastic reduction to $150,000,000 who might support a modest reduction of that kind. I am interested in and troubled by the remarks the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] made, that regardless of what we do on these amendments offered by the gentlemen from Virginia and Kansas the total amount will be spent in any event. For that reason, it seems regrettable to me that the votes are apparently lacking to accomplish a substantial saving in this appropriation of nearly a quarter of a billion dollars for these activities. The farmers themselves, with commendable spirit, have evidenced their approval of a real cut in the item we are considering through one of their spokesmen, Mr. Allen Kline, head of the National Grange. They realize that the waste of public funds or their use to advance political ends injures every segement of our economy.

I shall support the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas and, if that fails, the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia, but both of them only partially solve the problem before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] to close debate.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments.

Far be it from me to question the motives of my friend from Kansas or my friend from Virginia, but there are lots of misapprehensions here from lots of sources. There is a formula for the distribution of such funds as are in the soil conservation program. That formula is the basis for dividing the money as between the States. That formula is the basis for divisions within the State. If my friend were to cut this down to $100 each he would not get a dime more in his county, and if the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia prevailed he would not get a dime more in his county.

Not only that, but the practices that exist in the various States under an over-all classification of projects are determined by the State and county committees, so that they can select those soil practices that are badly needed in that area. Since this amendment does not affect what goes into anybody's State or what goes into anybody's county, why should you not let a county use its amount of money to meet the kind of problems it has? Some counties do have large farms. Nearly all the farmers are small farmers on a big landowner's farm. Why should not that county be permitted to use the money that is allocated to that county to meet the problems of that county? Some folks like the gentleman from Wisconsin have an area where flood control is the problem. Why should not they, if that is their problem and they have selected that as the practice that is greatly needed, set up a project that would relieve the situation?

The amount of the payment does not enter into how much land the man has and how much the money is that goes to him. When you limit the amount you limit the class and kind of project that can be done, and when you hold it down to peanuts you are limiting it to that class of soil conservation practice, which usually has less benefits.

In our committee report this year we stress the fact that we hope attention will be given to permanent and semi-permanent practices. When you reduce this amount of $2,500 to $750 you seriously interfere with that.

Why do I say that? In the Eightieth Congress you had this limitation. You also reduced the amount to $150,000,000. When you did that, dams to conserve water for irrigation or livestock or to control erosion fell off 45 percent. Range and pasture seeding fell off 33 percent. Terraces fell off 21 percent. Farm land drained by open and enclosed drains fell off 41 percent. Reorganizing irrigation ditches, dikes, or laterals to prevent erosion and conserve water fell off 52 percent. Improving pasture and range land by eradicating and controlling unpalatable and poisonous plants fell off 52 percent.

The amount of money you get is fixed by the formula. We recognize in the law that each State and each county should select practices that are badly needed in the several counties. I will be the first to give the gentleman from Kansas the right the law gives him to select the practices and limitations, and his county committee can fix limitations with the approval of the State committee on the amount that goes to any one farm. But I do say that since this money goes to delta counties or western counties or goes to the mountain counties of the western section of the country, if they want to have larger projects and need these larger projects, since that money has gone to them under the formula fixed by the Congress, I think it would be unsound for me, because my problems are different, to try to limit their projects. You did not do it in the basic law. You said there should be an over-all book or catalog of project, but you said that each State and each county in the over-all picture shall select those things that are needed, and shall determine the basis upon which you contribute to the cost of the projects in those areas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am sorry I cannot yield to the gentleman in view of the limitation of time, but I have listened to the gentleman repeatedly, and he has had to listen to me, but I do think he is trying to spread the problems which he has in his area over the Nation, and they do not quite fit. Far be it from me to try to put on his county and his State that which he does not want and which does not fit his area. But it follows that I think he is wrong to say that a county which has received so much money in the past under this program cannot work out projects that fit that county.

For that reason I hope you will defeat these amendments because if you do not defeat them you are in effect repealing the basic law.

The CHAIRMAN. All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REES of Kansas) there were—ayes 35, noes 72.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN and Mr. ABBITT) there were—ayes 50, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION PROGRAMS

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the request for tellers comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, as the Clerk had already started reading.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary to formulate and carry out acreage allotment and marketing quota programs pursuant to provisions of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1301–1393), and to provide assistance in obtaining equipment, materials, and facilities necessary to attain needed production of agricultural commodities, $8,300,000, of which not more than $2,000,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express interest at this time in this particular section and disappointment over the fact that it is my understanding the committee has not made any provision whereby the Agricultural Production and Marketing Administration would provide for the measurement of cotton acreage for 1951. I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee whether or not that is correct.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would have to agree with the gentleman that one of the greatest problems we had in trying to work out the cotton acreage was the fact that we did not have adequate records. I would be forced to agree with the gentleman that there are two ways to provide money. One is for the committee to bring it in, and the other is to offer amendments. The committee has not provided funds for that purpose. It was not provided by the budget, and if the gentleman has been around for the last 2 or 3 days, and I know he has been here actively participating, he can see that we are having trouble holding the line for appropriations even where we have reduced them. So having included money over and above the budget, it was just our belief that, serious as the situation was and great as the need was, that for the time being, the committee reached the conclusion that we just could not do it. So for that reason the amount is not in the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. I agree with the gentleman and many others that the necessity for reducing nonessential expenditures is very great. I, too, have voted for economy and reductions of nonessential spending when I could justify. My record is clear. This is necessary and essential. I think one of the greatest disservices that can be rendered to the cotton farmers of this country is the fact that there is no provision for adequate records, and yet when the time comes to impose cotton allotments, if it does in the future, you have no records whatsoever. Everyone knows the difficulty we had last year was from the fact that the so-called Bureau of Agricultural Economics reported one acreage in the county, the farmers reported another, and the county committees reported another. Finally we got into such a dilemma that it was absolutely necessary for the Congress to do something about it in order to clear it up for the year 1950. Yet we come along in 1951 and propose later to again impose such controls on the cotton farmers. You are going to find yourselves in the same dilemma. To me that is not economy. That is an injustice to the cotton farmers of this country.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am sure that the gentleman did not mean it like it sounded, as though the committee had ruined the cotton farmer in not bringing in the money. As I said, there are two ways to get this. One is for the committee to bring it in, and the other is to offer an amendment. I have not heard any amendment offered yet. I agree that the need for it is great, but I think the gentleman will agree with me that it is not exactly easy to get some of the money that we need for other things.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not mean to cast any reflection on the very able gentleman [Mr. WHITTEN] and his committee. You have done a good job and worked hard on this appropriation. I am inclined to think that the gentleman's committee should have brought in the money necessary for measurement of cotton acreage for this year and I believe this House, in view of the experience we had last year, would have upheld the gentleman's committee. The gentleman knows I have considered preparing an amendment. I talked to him about it. I talked to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, to the ranking member of that committee, and to other members of your committee. All of you seem to agree with me that it should be done, but you think it should not be brought in here as an amendment. Yet you do bring in, according to the report, funds in the agricultural production program amounting to $2,500,000 for a so-called national-defense program.

Just what that contains I do not know. It seems to me that we could very well increase the national-defense program by providing adequate records for the future for any national-defense requirement rather than simply making the statement "this is for the national-defense program," and nobody knows what the national defense program is.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi because I want to have a record made.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to say to the gentleman that he has talked to me about this program. I readily agree with him as to the problem involved and further agree that it would be well if this work were done. I also raised the question with the gentleman of how he would get funds for it at this time. I notice the gentleman has not offered his amendment. I think I told the gentleman that I would not oppose his amendment, although I cannot act for the whole committee. This bill would be different in several particulars if I could. But I do recognize the problem. I refuse, however, to take any responsibility for not having it in this bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS: Page 35, line 5, insert after the comma the following: "including the measurement of the acreage planted to cotton on farms, whether or not marketing quotas are in effect."

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the difficulty in endeavoring to provide funds——

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am not asking the gentleman to yield. I wish to make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order comes too late; the gentleman has already been recognized.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment simply because the cotton farmers of this country should have some way of compelling a record to be made of the 1951 cotton crop. It is true, I believe—and I have talked to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture—that consideration is being given by members of his great committee to provide a program for this 1951 year, but it is well known that an effort was made in the latter part of the last Congress to do something about it. While the program did pass this House, it never did get through the other body.

This, to me, Mr. Chairman, would, in my opinion, be a directive to the Production and Marketing Administration, through the county committees as the law requires, to undertake a program of determining the cotton acreage in the counties in the cotton-producing areas throughout the United States for future reference, if and when acreage allotments are put into effect. If farmers are

again forced to controls and will have to submit to acreage allotments and quotas they will at least have a record on which they could rely of the 1951 crop and thus avoid the inequities and injustices by the BAE estimates and merely guesses. It is not right for total counties' acreage planted pulled out of thin air. A record should be made.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, with whom I have discussed this problem, as well as with other Members.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. And I am sympathetic with the gentleman's problem. But I should like to know how much money is involved here, how much of this $8,300,000 would be taken for this work? Has the gentleman any idea as to that?

Mr. HARRIS. In all deference to the gentleman from Mississippi, the able chairman of the subcommittee—and I appreciate his position and the fact he wants this program carried out and recognizes the importance and desire for the measurement of 1951 cotton acreage for future records, if and when needed. I do not want us to be faced with any such dilemma as we had last year. Answering the gentleman from Minnesota, I would say probably a million dollars. I know that some down at the Department of Agriculture contend that if we go into this, measure the 1951 cotton crop, and make a record as we should have, it would take an entirely new staff and personnel. They say it would probably take about $5,000,000. In my opinion, however, with the existing county organizations set up, committees set up in each county, I do not see why with the funds here, $8,300,000, for administering OPC program, these county committees could not assume this responsibility that would be theirs and see that the cotton farmers of this country would have a record made in order that they may know in future years if such a control program is imposed upon them just what they can depend on.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. If the gentleman's amendment were to prevail, does he have any way of knowing if this work is done that the Department would not be back up here for a supplemental or deficiency appropriation?

Mr. HARRIS. I have no way of knowing that; however, from my investigation a part of the $8,300,000 provided here with $2,500,000 for so-called assistance to national defense program could be utilized for this purpose. What is going to be the nature of the national defense problems that requires $2,500,000 as provided for that purpose for the Department of Agriculture in relation to this agriculture-production program?

Mr. HORAN. In the gentleman's contact with the Department of Agriculture does he have any reason to believe that it would cost more than a million dollars?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes. In our conversation I was led to believe that if the Department is given everything that they think they should have, they will have to have new personnel for this purpose and in that instance it would cost about $5,000,000, according to them, but, in my opinion, they can do it with the present personnel supplimented some with the funds as contained in this amendment.

Mr. HORAN. Would the gentleman include language in his amendment so that we could be assured and we could be honest with the Congress or the committee here?

Mr. HARRIS. I want the gentleman to know that I never intend to be dishonest with the Committee.

Mr. HORAN. I know that.

Mr. HARRIS. Or with the Congress. At the same time I want to be honest with the farmers in this country and try to prevent them from suffering the dilemma they did a year ago.

Mr. HORAN. I was hoping there would be language in there so we would know what we were doing here with such an amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. I think the language speaks for itself. I believe it would be a directive to the Department of Agriculture to carry out this program, to measure the 1951 cotton acreage even though there is no quota controls or allotments in effect. It is for the purpose of having a record.

I hope this amendment is adopted. I believe it is justified and will prove to be necessary. It is not right to force controls on cotton farmers and impose further injustices of reduced allotments by failure to make records at this time when they could be correctly made.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. Chairman, we have a situation here, if the gentleman's amendment is adopted—and by the way I am sympathetic with the situation he describes—that the money, whether it be $1,000,000 or $3,000,000 or whatever amount it might be, must be expended out of this $8,300,000. It seems to me some of the work as described in that particular paragraph which the $8,300,000 was originally put in the bill for must therefore suffer. Just what particular work will suffer I have no idea whatsoever. I would much prefer voting on an amendment, if the gentleman will arrange his amendment in such fashion, limiting such expenditure under his amendment to not over $1,000,000. Then I could personally agree to it. But the door is wide open. This may require $5,000,000, then that will only leave $3,300,000 for all of the work under this particular paragraph.

Mr. HARRIS. I will be glad to accept an amendment to my amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman provide the language, and we will offer it? We want to be fair.

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman has language to fit, I will be glad to accept it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not have the time to prepare the language. If the gentleman will put a limitation of $1,000,000 on what he seeks to do, I will be glad to accept the amendment. Why does not the gentleman ask unanimous consent that his amendment be arranged in that fashion? I think the committee will agree to it.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not understand just what the gentleman means with reference to the language he proposes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Arkansas wants to do certain things. He wants the Congress to say that the work of measuring these cotton fields shall be done out of this money. I am agreeable to that if the gentleman will provide in his amendment that not over $1,000,000 of this $8,300,000 is used for that purpose.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not want to oppose this amendment and I can appreciate the value of having proper historical records, but I hope that the gentleman from Arkansas will accept the suggestion made and add to the amendment that the total cost shall not exceed $1,000,000. I understand that is the suggestion that was made.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman means to add $1,000,000?

Mr. COOLEY. No. Provide that the cotton survey shall not cost to exceed $1,000,000.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified as suggested by the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The effect of which will not be to increase any appropriation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct, and I think it is fair to all parties concerned.

Mr. COOLEY. But the cost of which shall not exceed $1,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, might I ask what the purpose of it is?

Mr. WHITTEN. It has been suggested, Mr. Chairman, in view of the unanimous-consent request, that the amendment be modified as follows: "Including," and then insert "not to exceed $1,000,000 be available for this purpose." That still leaves it coming out of the original figure, but it does say "not to exceed one million."

Mr. WERDEL. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee this question: He says he does not oppose the amendment, or does not want to oppose it. I would like to know just what the purpose of the amendment is.

Mr. WHITTEN. The purpose of the amendment is first, that you now have these controls, and you had them last year on cotton acreage. At that time they had no basis on which to determine what the historical acreage was that was given to the farmers. It is anticipated after this year you have to go back to controls, and you will have no adequate records on which to base your

law to go back to the control program this year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas that the amendment be modified?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS: Page 35, line 5, insert after the comma, the following: "including the measurement of the acreage planted to cotton on the farms whether or not marketing quotas are in effect, providing that not more than $1,000,000 be available for this purpose."

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the committee some additional questions. As I understand the purpose of the amendment, it is to avoid getting into the condition that we were in last year when, after 8 years of free enterprise in the cotton industry, acreage had moved west and from one part of a State to another part of that State. As I understand the law at the present time, controls are put on when the formula says they should be put on, and the law at the present time says when that formula does not go into effect, then anyone in the United States can raise cotton. If we want a history during that period of time of free enterprise when the formula is not in effect, somebody who proposes this amendment should tell us what the purpose of that history is when we are operating in free enterprise. If we have such a purpose that we can all agree to, then certainly why should we put into law a provision that a function be entered into by the Department which might cost $50,000,000 and limit it to the expenditure of $1,000,000 without any discussion or understanding of what the actual amount of money necessary should be.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WERDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I have talked to a number of Members of Congress on committees, both the Committee on Appropriation and the Committee on Agriculture and I have talked to the staff members down at the Department of Agriculture. I have been advised by some here in Congress that it would cost probably $1,000,000 to make a record of the 1951 planted acreage. The Department of Agriculture says if they have to set up a new organization altogether, go out and employ new personnel, a complete new organization, then they would expect it to cost about $5,000,000. That is the reason we think perhaps $1,000,000 would be sufficient at least to start this program.

I will say to the gentleman in answer to his other question that when we had a cotton-acreage allotment program in effect in 1950 it was based on the acreage planted in 1946, 1947, and 1948. I have in my hand the report that was issued insofar as the counties in my district are concerned. The BAE cotton-acreage report for 1946, 1947, and 1948 was one thing. The producers reported cotton acreage in an entirely different amount. The basic allotment by the committee was an entirely different acreage altogether, and the final allotment was another acreage. If we have future allotments that are going to be based on the amount of the preceding 5 years, not counting, of course, 1949, we will have a record for 1950, and the records for 1946, 1947, and 1948 will have been made, whether they are correct or not; but in order to complete it, it will be necessary to have a record for 1951. If we do not have that record, you will have the BAE reporting one thing, you will have the farmers reporting another, and you will have the committees again reporting another. This is for the purpose of having the cotton farmers of the gentleman's State as well as my own, big and little farmers, knowing exactly what they can count on if that record is made.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WERDEL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman from California represents the largest cotton-growing county in our State. His opinion on this is good. The gentleman from Arkansas has now raised a new question. He said, "at least for a beginning." It seems to me that does raise the question of how much is involved.

Now I ask the gentleman from California this. As I remember the problem in the very small way it affected my particular district, the problem was not whether the figures were correct or not; it was whether the acreage could follow the farmer. The gentleman from California will also remember that in California a great deal of acreage was allotted to 5-acre plots. We have no 5-acre cotton farms in California. Does the gentleman remember that?

Mr. WERDEL. Yes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. How would the proposal affect that?

Mr. WERDEL. That is one of the things I am trying to find out.

Mr. HARRIS. There is no better way in the world you can preserve that 5-acre block than to have a history made of it so when an allotment is made to California, whatever it will be you will know what it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I will not object to this request, but I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL] for three additional minutes.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, may I take this additional time to say that I understand the purpose of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], and I think it should be clear in the RECORD that during these years when controls are not in effect we need a history under the existing law to determine what the allotments should be when they do go into effect. I point out, however, that $1,000,000 is not enough money. If the limitation is on it, it should be increased in the Senate, because it is my recollection that in round numbers there are seven or eight million acres of cotton raised on tracts of 5 acres or less. To try to get the history of that many farms with $1,000,000, each of them having 5 acres or less, is impossible. I point that out to the Committee for its consideration.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WERDEL. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think probably the gentleman is right. However, in view of all of the confusion we had heretofore, as well as that which we have had on the floor of the House in regard to this program, I believe there will be a sufficient amount of interest at the farm level to supplement such labor as the department will have to have to procure these accurate measurements. I think this is a step in the right direction.

Mr. WERDEL. But I point out to the gentleman there is less than a dollar per grower here to get that history. We can get more confusion if you have to make a report under such circumstances than we had last time.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WERDEL. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Any one man who goes out to take the history can walk out and see the acreage in a few minutes, and find out just how much acreage there is. And you talk about one man to a farm. One man can go out and get the correct allotment in a day for a number of farms, so it would not necessarily be a question of how much money is going to be allocated to one cotton farmer.

Mr. WERDEL. That may be true in Arkansas, but we do not walk that fast in California.

Mr. HARRIS. You know pretty well what you have in your acreage lots out there.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I think the action of the House, if it takes the course today of adopting this amendment, will go a long way toward alleviating possible confusion and chaos in the future if a program of cotton acreage allotments is set up again. I am sure all of you who have been Members of the House during the past few years are familiar with the great struggles which went on here and the waste of time and various other expensive and costly delays which were occasioned as a result of the confusion which came about when we went into acreage allotments for the first time after being off of them for several years during the war.

Many of the cotton farmers in my district have indicated to me they are willing to finance a large part of this acreage measurement themselves and that it is necessary in order that a clear picture of the acreage history may be preserved. But this provision in the bill, to provide some type of acreage history by the Department, I believe can go a

long way toward establishing a fairer and clearer acreage allotment program in the future.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to tell the Members of the House one experience where one cotton farmer claimed that he had so many acres planted for the years 1946, 1947, and 1948. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics reported an entirely different figure. When he finally brought in his acreage insurance certificate, they then accepted it and gave him what he said he had planted. That was the only way in the world he had of presenting any record whatsoever which they would believe. There was one farmer perhaps out of hundreds and hundreds who had a crop insurance record which they would accept.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The gentleman is correct. The adoption of this amendment will save the House a lot of headaches in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield my time, if I may, to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] for 6 minutes.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL]. If it is necessary to increase this amount of money in the other body in order to do a fair and just job of work, it certainly should be done, because there never was a situation more chaotic which characterized the small, family-sized farmer, and larger farmers, too, than that which resulted when cotton quotas were again imposed in 1950. A great deal is being said from day to day about short crops. I read in the Washington Post recently about a short wheat crop, and about other grain crops being short. Of course we all know there has been a very short cotton crop in the last season.

One of the signal things that is never mentioned, however, is that one of the reasons for these shortages is that the farm program is having the effect, in instances at least, of driving some people off of the farms.

I have in my possession letters and information which say exactly this, that one of the reasons people are leaving the farms is because of the way in which acreage allotments are handled.

As I have said so many times, and incidentally I have placed many letters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to that effect and nobody has ever disputed them, it is a known fact that throughout the South people had to leave the farms because they did not have ample acreage allotted to them to justify remaining there.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I wish to call attention to the fact that a year ago and 2 years ago the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] and others of us called attention to that fact, that as a result thousands left Texas congressional districts and many thousands left western Oklahoma.

Mr. BECKWORTH. One district in my State of Texas alone lost 50,000 people in 10 years according to the last census. Other districts in States close by lost many people. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] and I predicted when certain cotton legislation was debated on the floor of the House in August 1949 this would happen. Restrictive legislation was then passed which drove people from the farms and which would not let the war workers who wanted to return to the farms and veterans return. One of the reasons is that when people sought to come back from the war and from defense plants they could not get a farm to work. I have a letter from a man who owns 320 acres of land. He said that he had been penalized $108 for growing one bale of cotton; that he had 3.6 acres. He also had 2.6 acres of peanuts. He said in effect in the letter to me, which was written on April 30, "How can you expect me to obey an order of the Government to undertake to grow more crops when I am being penalized like that this year?"

Much has been said about the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. I do not know what the experience of the average Member has been, but that is one section of the Department of Agriculture where it often is rather difficult at times to get information; I suppose they do the best they can. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] is correct when he makes the assertion that countless farmers have contended that they had grown so many acres of a given crop over a period of years, when the Bureau of Agricultural Economics simply said, "This is what we have on your account." As for accuracy, in my opinion most of the farmers being honest, knew what they had grown better than the BAE.

I say that this proposition of people leaving the farms, certainly in some sections of the country, is a serious thing. I think if that trend does not cease we are going to see even more shortages. I hope that as the question of shortages developes there will be a few more questions as to what relationship leaving the farm frequently by compulsion, at least indirectly, on the part of people during the last 10 years is having on shortages. I think we might very well afford to study that particular thing. After all, the commercial farmer—and there are commercial farmers—is in business to make all the dollars he can, and when the dollars become scarce he is not going to stay there like the family-sized farmer who likes to farm because he can earn a living at it and because there, too, is attached a certain amount of liberty and freedom that cannot be found in many other vocations. I repeat, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] is to be commended for offering this amendment, and I hope that the proper study will be given to it in the Senate, and that ample money will be made available to see that every farmer who wants to farm is given a square deal when the acreage allotments are reimposed. Only can this occur if there are adequate and accurate records.

To show you how confused the Department of Agriculture is on this subject, I wrote a letter to the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. McCormick, in which I asked him if allotments are reimposed in 1952 what will happen to farmers who undertake to grow cotton.

He answered me like this, and the letter is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that the acreage allotments may be affected a whole lot, or none at all, or somewhere in between.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD certain data:

WINTER WHEAT ESTIMATE DROPS TO SMALLEST CROP SINCE 1943

(By John W. Ball)

The Government Crop Reporting Board yesterday forecast the smallest winter wheat crop since 1943. Between April 1 and May 1 the indicated crops shrank 44,000,000 bushels.

The prospect on May 1, the Board stated, was for only 682,000,000 bushels, compared with 750,000,000 bushels last year (when plantings were restricted by the Government), 902,000,000 bushels in 1949, and 1,007,000,000 bushels in 1948.

The gloomy crop outlook—which, if correct, will lower the 1952 carry-over to only 300,000,000 bushels—is almost certain to stiffen congressional opposition against giving any wheat to India. There already has been some pressure for lending India money and letting it buy the grain elsewhere.

The report clearly indicated that unless there is an unusual spring wheat crop the country this year won't raise enough wheat to meet domestic requirements and already committed exports under the International Wheat Agreement and other agreements. Planting of spring wheat, the report said, has been delayed by wet weather in most areas, but is finally progressing well.

The serious damage to the crop from drought and insect infestation is shown in the following figures: (1) Almost 27 percent of the acreage planted to wheat has been abandoned, compared to average abandonment of 10 percent; (2) yield is predicted at only 16.6 bushels an acre compared with 17.1 last year, 18.8 bushels in 1948, and 19.5 bushels in 1947.

Oats, the report said, are far below normal, averaging only 58 percent compared with 62 percent last May and an average of 71 percent for this time of year.

The report commented that farm work was badly delayed in April. It gave no estimate of the extent of damage due to late planting. It also did not comment on the delay in preparing the soil in the Midwest corn area for corn planting. It mentioned that "seeding of spring grains was delayed in much of the north central region," and then added that "seeding of spring wheat acreage, however, is now probable under fairly favorable conditions."

Spring commercial truck crops have been retarded, with prospects for 5 to 7 percent less than last year. Sharp declines from last year are foreseen for onions, cabbage, and carrots, with smaller declines for nine other vegetables. Increases are forecast in cucumbers, cantaloupes, and spinach.

"Prospects for apples are good in Maryland," the report stated. "The low temperatures during April did little damage to the crop.

"In Virginia the freeze on April 17 to 19 damaged early blooming varieties, especially

Delicious. The bloom on most varieties except York has been heavy.

"In West Virginia * * * prospects are for a good crop."

EUSTACE, TEX., *April 30, 1951.*

To CONGRESSMAN LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Washington, D. C.

Well, LINDY, here I come for some information from you. Now I am asking you. Well they wrote me and said I owed them $108.50 for growing a bale of cotton in 1950 because I did not sign a contract. My allotment is 3.6 acres. Say, I can't live on that small acreage. My peanuts acreage is 2.6 acres. I did not violate God's law growing one bale, as bad as we need it. My tax is so high I can't pay them everything, so high everybody left the farm and went to town to work. I am asking you, do I have to pay that $108.50, or must I ignore it? So give me your opinion on it and answer at once. If I do have to pay for it, I am quitting farming to go to town to work. I can make a better living in town. I am growing peanuts for feed for my cattle. I did not ask the Government for help, and, if I can't grow what I want to on my farm enough to keep it up, there is no need staying on it. So the farmer is so handicapped he can't grow enough anyhow.

So this year they want me to grow all the cotton I can. Trying to fine me for growing one bale in 1950, now what must I do—pay or not?

Now, here is the situation: Now I have 320 acres; my neighbor has 100 acres. He has 37 acres peanut allotment, I have 1 acre. So I am keeping a copy of this letter I am sending you. So tell me, do I have to pay or not? You find out and let me hear from you. I have been your supporter and Truman, too, so, I am trying to support the Government every way I can. My desire is grow something but the —— does not want me to sell it, but by being penalized for it. If you can read this—I am left-handed—so answer as soon as you well can.

T. C. MEWBORNE.

MINEOLA, TEX., *May 1, 1951.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Third Congressional District,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LINDLEY: I have decided to write you concerning a problem that concerns not only you and I but our whole Nation.

It is the absentee ownership of land as I have seen it and read about in the State of Texas. I am sure you must have given no little thought to the matter as the decline of population in your district I feel is a definite outgrowth of this evil.

Many reasons for that decline is given by one and another authority but in my opinion the fact that good farms and ranches being as nearly unobtainable as they have become since so many business and professional people and people of means have developed the fad of buying farms as a hobby or else for speculation purposes.

* * * * *

* * * own about 12,000 acres of land composed completely of small farms purchased and assembled into a block operated by one or two hired hands on each three or four thousand acres of land which formerly furnished a living for some 40 to 60 people or rather families.

* * * are just examples, there are numbers more owning hundreds of acres acquired in the same manner, and with hardly an exception these are people that acquired their money in some other manner than farming.

Add to these people the lower income professional people who buy one or two small farms each and the many farms our old folks are living on and not operating and not able to rent or sell under the present administration of our old age pension law and you will see the difficulties faced by a person of moderate means who likes to farm or grow stock and also the reason our population is declining in our rural areas.

Also the ill will toward our Government created by these conditions is of no small import since as I am certain you are aware, the ownership of the majority of land by a few large landowners has always been a matter of disturbance in whatever country it has and is occurring.

This is a State-wide—and probably a Nation-wide—problem as you can readily see by checking the sharp fall in the number of individually owned farms in the State of Texas during the last decade.

Being a man of limited education and experience in such matters I can recommend no pat solution but do feel that through taxes or other means this situation should be remedied for the good of our Nation and its people and especially the future generations.

I am a disabled ex-marine—World War II—sent to the farm by the doctors to find a means of livelihood more suited to my health and after 2 years of renting while trying to find a farm to buy have been made well aware of the situation in east Texas and I hope you will find this whole problem worthy of your attention and consideration.

Sincerely,

BARTON S. HILL.

WILLS POINT, TEX., *April 29, 1951.*

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

DEAR LINDLEY: I have been intending to write you for some time in regards to some of the things that are being passed and put on farmers and stockraisers.

First, DiSalle set the ceiling price on cotton at 45 cents and just across the Mexican border, cotton is selling for 85 cents a pound.

I sit here with a Dallas newspaper's headlines on beef prices. To be cutback 10 cents a pound. Still Brannan is asking for 16,000 bales of cotton. This is, as you know, around Wills Point, a cotton and cattle country. Our son, D. L., Jr., and I, are farming 550 acres of land, and farm machinery is up this year about 25 percent above last year. Gasoline is up 2 cents a gallon, but DiSalle, Wilson, and Brannan are doing nothing about it. Fire the hell out of all.

* * * * *

LINDLEY we think you are tops, but for God sakes what is wrong up there. Guess by now you will say just another old fogy fool. I was at the cotton meeting in the bank. In regards to cotton allotments last year, Mr. Curtis asked me to state my allotment and acreage which I did, and I do want to tell you. I, my wife, and son did appreciate what you did in getting the cotton allotment raised.

LINDLEY, in 1949, D. L., Jr., and I, ginned 74 bales of cotton; in 1950, we ginned 37 bales, 14,000 pounds of vetch, 600 bushels of corn. After expenses were paid, we did not pay income tax, for expenses got it all. Still the farmer makes it all.

Your friend,

DAVE FULLER.

Mr. Chairman, farmers in my section have been told to go to raising cattle. Some of them tried to do so. Note their problems in the enclosed letters:

PITTSBURG, TEX., *May 5, 1951.*

The Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: After reading the attached article in the Wichita Daily Times, April 29, 1951, Wichita Falls, Tex., I have learned that it is the intention of the Office of Price Stabilization to roll back the price of beef received by the producers 18 percent by October 1951.

I am not a cattle king, and it is not my intent to become a cattle baron, but I am one of the many small producers of beef cattle who would like to have a decent return on the money and time I have invested in this enterprise.

To go further into detail, I will give you the following facts relative to my operation:

I have 108 acres in Camp and Upshire Counties and I use 211 acres in Franklin County, ownership being in the family. These two farms are ordinary east Texas farms and I judge worth $11,000. The two farms are stocked with 48 cows and 2 bulls. These cows are common cows, most of them of Hereford type, with an occasional Angus, Shorthorn, or brindle cow. My bulls are Hereford and from considerably better stock than the cows. These cows are worth a minimum of $10,000.

As you will know, from your past experience, a certain amount of costly equipment is necessary in order for an organization of this type to function. These items will include a pick-up truck, wire stretchers, lariat ropes, all sorts of hand tools and shovels, etc. I believe that allowing $2,000 for this expense is not excessive. In addition, $1,000 is needed to take care of any overhead.

The annual calf crop to be expected will run about 80 percent, therefore I expect to sell around 40 calves annually from my 48 cows at April 25, 1951, prices. These calves when sold at 9 or 10 months of age would average about $100 each, or $4,000.

Expenses during the year for feed, automobile expenses and maintenance of fences and buildings alone will certainly amount to $1,000 each year, leaving a net expected return of $3,000.

If we, the producers, are cut back 18 percent as proposed by OPS, then my income will be reduced 18 percent of $4,000, which is $720. This amount deducted from my net income of $3,000 will leave only $2,280.

I believe and I think that you will agree that a return of $2,280 for 1 year's work and a $24,000 investment is entirely too little under current conditions. I also believe that this proposed OPS roll back is unjustified and is discriminatory against the producer of beef cattle, when other expenses are not rolled back proportionately.

Any assistance or information you may be able to give will certainly be appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

W. REX SPENCER.

PITTSBURGH, TEX., *April 2, 1951.*

LINDLEY BECKWORTH,

DEAR SIR: I am a small farmer with a few cattle, with high-priced feed and higher wages would make an awful hard go, with cattle prices cut back.

Our cattle have been raised on high-priced feed. If the cut-back comes, I don't see anything to do except quit producing cattle.

I hope we can get some relief and am asking you to do what you can to help us cattle growers.

Very respectfully,

H. M. MELTON.

Note the answers again. I fear these small livestock growers, like the small farmers, are faced with very serious problems which could result in shortages.

OFFICE OF PRICE STABILIZATION,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your expressed interest in behalf of Mr. W. Rex Spencer, rural route 5, box 12, Pittsburg, Tex., who has objected to the control of meat prices.

On January 26, 1951, the Office of Price Stabilization issued the General Ceiling Price Regulation, which froze prices of processors and distributors at levels prevailing

December 19, 1950 to January 25, 1951. This price freeze was issued on the decision that definite action was necessary to put the breaks on inflation.

During the week of June 24, 1950, immediately prior to the start of the Korean situation, the weekly average price of prime cattle at Chicago as reported by the United States Department of Agriculture was $31.42 per hundredweight. During the week of April 21, 1951, the weekly average price of prime cattle had reached $40.88 per hundredweight and the dressed carcass price was $59.70. This was in the period when cattle was in large supply. Due to this rapid rise in prices, it has been found necessary to control the price of beef because it is such an important item in our economy.

Although the average prices paid to farmers for beef cattle on January 26, 1951, had increased considerably, these prices were not frozen by the General Ceiling Price Regulation because there was no effective grading service available at the time. When the regulation was issued, however, this office stated that controls on livestock prices would be announced later. By April 15, prices of prime grade steers were 30 percent above those in June 1950. Choice grade steers were up 26 percent.

The ceiling price regulation on beef cattle will leave cattle prices at about the level prevailing December 19, 1950, to January 25, 1951, or about 10 percent below recent high levels. These ceiling prices, as reflected at the slaughter level, are 14 to 18 percent higher than the prices paid cattlemen in June of last year.

The price freeze issued last January froze prices which retailers, wholesalers, and slaughterers could charge for beef but did not, however, freeze prices at which the producers of live animals could sell their cattle. Live cattle were exempted because the Office of Price Stabilization recognized that a freeze applied without previous notice would result in a severe hardship to cattle feeders. In order to make it possible for cattle feeders to adjust their operations, the Director of Price Stabilization announced at the time of the January price freeze that ceilings on livestock prices would be issued later. Also, in the price ceilings which were announced on April 30, the adjustments in live cattle prices are made gradually and the adjustments in prices are taken in three different steps so that time will be allowed for cattle feeders to govern their transactions accordingly.

The reductions which will be effective July 29 and September 30 will leave beef cattle prices up to 7 percent above those of last June or between 120 to 125 percent of parity. Department of Agriculture estimates of production costs indicate that under these established ceiling prices, the producers will make a reasonable profit and maintain present level of beef cattle numbers.

It is felt, therefore, that the relationship of these prices to other farm commodities will be such as to be an incentive for a continuing high production of beef. You may be assured that this part of the stabilization program will be periodically reviewed, in order that any changes warranted by facts can be made so that the program will be more effective.

Very truly yours,

KARL K. BECHTOLD,
Office of the Special Assistant to the Director.

OFFICE OF PRICE STABILIZATION,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your expressed interest in behalf of Mr. H. M. Melton, rural route 5, box 12, Pittsburg, Tex., who has objected to the control of meat prices.

On January 26, 1951, the Office of Price Stabilization issued the General Ceiling Price Regulation, which froze prices of processors and distributors at levels prevailing December 19, 1950, to January 25, 1951. This price freeze was issued on the decision that definite action was necessary to put the brakes on inflation.

During the week of June 24, 1950, immediately prior to the start of the Korean situation, the weekly average price of prime cattle at Chicago as reported by the United States Department of Agriculture was $31.42 per hundredweight. During the week of April 21, 1951, the weekly average price of prime cattle had reached $40.88 per hundredweight, and the dressed carcass price was $59.70. This was in the period when cattle was in large supply. Due to this rapid rise in prices, it has been found necessary to control the price of beef because it is such an important item in our economy.

Although the average prices paid to farmers for beef cattle on January 26, 1951, had increased considerably, these prices were not frozen by the General Ceiling Price Regulation because there was no effective grading service available at the time. When the regulation was issued, however, this Office stated that controls on livestock prices would be announced later. By April 15, prices of prime grade steers were 30 percent above those in June 1950. Choice grade steers were up 26 percent.

The ceiling price regulation on beef cattle will leave cattle prices at about the level prevailing December 19, 1950, to January 25, 1951, or about 10 percent below recent high levels. These ceiling prices, as reflected at the slaughter level, are 14 to 18 percent higher than the prices paid cattlemen in June of last year.

The price freeze issued last January froze prices which retailers, wholesalers, and slaughterers could charge for beef but did not, however, freeze prices at which the producers of live animals could sell their cattle. Live cattle were exempted because the Office of Price Stabilization recognized that a freeze applied without previous notice would result in a severe hardship to cattle feeders. In order to make it possible for cattle feeders to adjust their operations, the Director of Price Stabilization announced at the time of the January price freeze that ceilings on livestock prices would be issued later. Also, in the price ceilings which were announced on April 30, the adjustments in live cattle prices are made gradually and the adjustments in prices are taken in three different steps so that time will be allowed for cattle feeders to govern their transactions accordingly.

The reductions, which will be effective July 29 and September 30, will leave beef cattle prices up to 7 percent above those of last June or between 120 to 125 percent of parity. Department of Agriculture estimates of production costs indicate that under these established ceiling prices, the producers will make a reasonable profit and maintain present level of beef cattle numbers.

It is felt, therefore, that the relationship of these prices to other farm commodities will be such as to be an incentive for a continuing high production of beef. You may be assured that this part of the stabilization program will be periodically reviewed, in order that any changes warranted by facts can be made so that the program will be more effective.

Very truly yours,

KARL K. BECHTOLD,
Office of the Special Assistant to the Director.

Mr. Chairman, it is unwise and dangerous in my opinion to permit segments of the farm program and certain governmental orders to have the effect of forcing people off the farm or out of the stock-raising business. I have opposed and do oppose this being done. I repeat what I have said before, I am for free enterprise on the farm just as I am for free enterprise in business.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., December 15, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to questions which you raised in our telephone conversation of November 27, and also in reply to your letter of November 27, 1950, regarding what might happen to a particular county's cotton-acreage allotment and the allotments for individual farms within the county, if cotton-acreage allotments should be required in 1952.

In our letter of November 24, 1950, we outlined the present provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, that would probably cause 1952 State and county cotton-acreage allotments, if required, to vary from those established in 1950—in many cases the difference would be substantial—even if no change is made in the national acreage allotment in 1952 from 1950. This is true because of changes in base periods and in formulas provided in the act for apportioning the national allotment to States and the State acreage allotments to counties. We have also discussed with you in previous letters that the provisions of the act do not include the acreage planted to cotton in 1951 in the base for establishing 1952 State and county allotments and, therefore, will not affect them.

Since farm cotton-acreage allotments are determined primarily on a uniform county percentage of cropland, the acreage planted to cotton on a farm has little bearing on the allotment. The law provides that the acreage of cotton be used in determining minimum and maximum allotments in distributing the county allotment—less the acreage reserved by the county committee—to eligible cotton farms. Therefore, if all farmers in a county should double their cotton acreage in 1951 over 1950, the 1952 farm allotments may be changed considerably or none at all or somewhere between, depending on how farmers in the particular county vary their cotton acreage in proportion to cropland.

In view of the many factors affecting allotments as provided by law it is impossible to determine what the 1952 county and farm cotton-acreage allotments would be, is required, until the provisions of the act have been applied in determining State, county, and farm allotments. Consequently, even though we assume that (1) there will be cotton-acreage allotments and marketing quotas in 1952, (2) the national allotment for 1952 would be the same as the 1950 national allotment, and (3) a particular farm or county plants exactly twice as much cotton in 1951 as was planned in 1950 it would still be impossible to determine the changes in any given county allotment or the farm allotments within a given county.

Sincerely yours,

C. J. MCCORMICK,
Under Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, I include several letters about peanuts and cotton:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICUL[illegible],
PRODUCTION AND MA[illegible]NG
ADMINI[illegible]TION,
Wellington, Tex., May 31, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of May 16, 1950, with reference to the peanut-acreage allotment for our country:

1. We have 109 farms with peanut allotments.

2. Producers in general should have at least 15 acres per farm in order to grow them economically.

3. There are 78 farms in the county that have an allotment of less than 15 acres.

4. We have 15 farms with less than 2-acre allotments.

5. All farms with less than 2-acre allotments will cease to grow peanuts.

6. Probably none of these producers will cease to farm for themselves, but will have to grow other crops for a livelihood.

7. We have 21 producers who applied for new-grower allotments.

8. A total of 27.3 acres were allotted to new growers of this county by the State committee.

9. On an average each new grower received 1.3 acres.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Quincy, Fla., May 26, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of May 12, 1950, we have 175 peanut producers in Gadsden County. The least number of acres a farmer can grow economically is usually 5 acres; 89 of these allotments are under 5 acres; 39 received less than 2 acres. Nearly all of these will quit growing peanuts for harvest. We have no way of knowing how many farmers will cease to farm for themselves on this account. It will cause some to do so. Seventeen new growers applied for peanut acreage this year—1950. We have 17.4 acres to distribute to them. These range from 0.5 to 1.7 acres.

Trusting this is the information you desired, I am,

Yours truly,
BERNARD H. CLARK,
Administrative Officer, Gadsden County, PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Giddings, Tex., May 29, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Reference is made to your letter of May 15 and we herewith enclose the following information:

1. Number of peanut farms in Lee County: 1,054.

2. The least number a farmer can afford to grow: 10.

3. Number of producers receiving allotments less than the above: 661.

4. Number of producers receiving allotments less than 2 acres: 174.

5. Number of producers who will cease to grow peanuts (approximate): 50.

6. Number of producers who will cease to farm for themselves (approximate): 25.

7. Number of producers who applied for new grower allotment, 1950: 72.

8. Number of acres to distribute to them: 109.7.

9. Approximate acreage for each new grower: 1.5.

Very truly yours,
WARREN D. MOODY,
Secretary, Lee County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Quitman, Tex., May 29, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in reference to your letter, dated May 13, 1950, to the Wood County PMA Committee.

We have approximately 400 peanut producers in the county. The least number of acres each producer can afford to grow is 2 acres. We have about 150 producers who received allotments of less than 2 acres. Of those growers having allotments of less than 2 acres, there will be about 25 or 50 who will cease to grow peanuts. I do not believe there will be any cease to farm for themselves. The number of new producers were 35 and the number of acres distributed was 21.4 acres and the average to each was 0.6 of an acre.

The excess acreage (for soil) up to the 1947 picked and threshed will help at least 150 or 200 producers in Wood County.

Hoping the above is the desired information, I am

Yours very truly,
ROY E. BARNETT,
Secretary, Wood County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION,
Allendale, S. C., June 1, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I am listing below the information requested in your letter dated May 18, 1950:

1. What is the least number of acres an average farmer can afford to grow or economically grow: 5.

2. How many producers received allotments less than the number of acres shown in 1: 135.

3. How many peanut producers received allotments less than 2 acres: 76.

4. Of the number of peanut farmers receiving allotments of less than 2 acres, how many will cease to grow peanuts: 50 percent.

5. Approximately how many will cease to farm for themselves: None.

6. How many new producers applied for peanut acreage this year (1950): 9.

7. How many acres were distributed to them: 18.6.

8. Approximately how much did each receive: 2.

Very truly yours,
HENRY B. BARKER,
County Administrative Officer, PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Quitman, Tex., April 10, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in reference to your letter of April 5, 1950, to the county committee.

(1) The number of farmers receiving 5 acres of cotton or less was 1,248. (2) The number of new producers that applied for allotments were 340. (3) The acreage that was available to distribute among the new producers was 300. (4) Each producer received from 1 to 1.1 acres. (5) The number of zero allotments were 10. (6) The percent of new producers regarded as genuine farmers was 88 percent (300) applications.

The number applications left from item 2 less item 5, less item 6, consisted of 30 applications that did not meet the necessary eligibility requirements.

If you desire further information, please advise.

Yours very truly,
ROY E. BARNETT,
Secretary, Wood County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Cross City, Fla., May 31, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congressman, Third Congressional District of Texas,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Reference is made to your letter of May 12 relative to peanut producers in Dixie County, Fla. Dixie County is primarily a livestock county and most of the farmers produce peanuts for hog feed. However, we do have some 20 farmers who grow peanuts for digging. Of these 18 have less than 2 acres allotment. It is the general thinking of the average farmer that they cannot economically dig and pick less than 5 acres. Of the number of farmers having less than 2 acres allotments none will cease growing peanuts but about 75 percent of them will not dig. We had no new producers applying for acreage this year but the reason for this was that when told the probable size of new grower allotments those that were interested decided that it would not be worth the trouble of filing out the forms.

Trusting that this is the information that you desire, I am,

Very truly yours,
CLARENCE L. DICKINSON,
County Agent.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMISISTRATION,
Burnet, Tex., May 29, 1950.

To: Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

From: Raby A. Alford, secretary, Burnet County PMA.

Subject: Information requested in letter of May 13, 1950.

Information as requested is listed below:

What is the least number of acres average peanut producer can afford to grow: 5.

How many producers received allotments less than acreage mentioned above: 7.

How many of your peanut farmers received allotments of less than 2 acres: 2.

How many of this number (receiving allotments of less than 2 acres) will cease to grow peanuts: 2.

How many will cease to farm for themselves: None.

How many new producers applied for peanut acreage in 1950: 2.

How many acres did you distribute to them: 4.7.

Approximately how much did each receive: 1.5 and 3.2.

OFFICE OF MAYOR,
CITY OF KILGORE, TEX.,
September 30, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LINDLEY: Enclosed is a photo copy of a cotton notice to Tommie N. Nixon, who resides near Kilgore, which is self-explanatory.

I think it a shame and disgrace to penalize this man—or any other person of like status—for growing three bales of cotton on a little old worn-out east Texas farm, especially in the face of such a short cotton crop throughout the Nation this year, and with a big demand for cotton. We here in Kilgore can't buy sheets for our new hospital because of shortages of sheets on the market.

I have known Tommie for 30 years or more. During all these years he has been trying to eke out a living raising whatever

crops and stock he could in order to live—not make money. He lives outside the oil field and has no income from that source. As I understand it, he didn't grow any cotton for perhaps 1 or 2 years and for that reason was refused a quota for this year.

In view of the fact there is every indication now there will be no restrictions on planting cotton in 1951; the short crop this year and the high cost of living for these poor farmers, I see no reason why these restrictions can't be lifted now and give these people the relief so badly needed.

What can you do about it now?

Regards and best wishes.

Sincerely,

ROY H. LAIRD.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Burbaw, N. C., May 26, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HONORABLE BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of May 18, 1950. The following is a list of the questions and answers requested in your letter:

1. The number of peanut producers in Pender County: 335.
2. Number of acres of peanuts a producer can grow economically: 5.
3. Number of allotments less than 5 acres in county: 185.
4. Number of allotments in county less than 2 acres: 56.
5. Number of allotments in county less than 2 acres which will not be planted: None.
6. Approximately how many will cease to farm for themselves: None.
7. Number of producers who applied for new allotments in Pender County in 1950: 11.
8. How many acres did we have to distribute to them? We did not have any acreage to distribute to them as the distribution of acreage is done in Raleigh for new growers.
9. How many acres did the new growers receive in Pender County: 3.

Very truly yours,

T. W. GARRISS,
Secretary, Pender County PMA.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C., October 4, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: We have tabulated the information on the number of farmers who received cotton-acreage allotments of less than 5 acres which you requested in our recent telephone conversation and your note of September 26.

A summary of this information taken from the letters published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 26, July 31, September 22, and September 23 shows the following:

Number of allotments of less than 5 acres reported	22,145
Those who will grow no cotton:	
Number	4,453
Percent	20
Those who will quit farming:	
Number	878
Percent	4

I am returning the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS and am enclosing the listing sheets as you may be interested in reviewing the individual items.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER W. WILCOX,
Senior Specialist, Agriculture, Legislative Reference Service.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Henrietta, Tex., June 1, 1950.

LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: There are 42 peanut producers in Clay County. About 3 acres is the least number of acres a farmer can afford to grow. There were 13 producers in this county that received allotments of less than the 3 acres mentioned above. There were six producer that received allotments of less than 2 acres. Peanut farmers receiving allotments of less than 2 acres, will cease to grow peanuts commercially but will grow some for home use. None will cease to farm for themselves. There were 13 new producers that applied for peanut acreage in Clay County in 1950. New grower reserves were retained in the State office. All new growers received a total of 13.4 acres.

Yours truly,

ERMON D. WILLIAMS,
Secretary, Clay County PMA.

[From the Farmer-Stockman of November 1950]

TALKS WITH OUR READERS

(By Ferdie J. Deering, editor)

The futility of Government attempts to control crop production through acreage allotments is demonstrated again in the 1950 cotton-crop failure. So, for 1951 at least, there won't be any acreage controls on the cotton crop.

The breakdown of the allotment system might be glossed oved by designating last springs' "cotton surplus" as a "national reserve" this fall. But that won't keep farmers from regarding last spring's red tape in the form of red ink this fall. What does it matter if cotton sells for 40 cents a pound if you lost your crop to bugs, bad weather, and bureaucrats?

Farmers planted only about 18,000,000 of the 21,000,000 acres allotted this year, in spite of clamor for larger allotments in some areas. Texas in 1949 grew about one-third of the Nation's cotton, so drew a big cut in acreage this year. But farmers planted 8 percent less than allotted. Oklahoma, with a small allotment, failed by about 19 percent to get it all planted.

A survey by Texas Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH revealed that one reason was that, all over the Cotton Belt, thousands of farmers received less than 5 acres cotton-acreage allotment. Many of these planted no cotton.

In Oklahoma, 384 of LeFlore County's 2,097 cotton growers had less than 5 acres. In Stephens County 305 had 5 acres or less, in Atoka County 659 growers were assigned less than 5 acres. In Carter County, where Ardmore was once a major inland cotton market, 154 of the 735 old cotton growers had under 5 acres. The list could be extended in Texas, Tennessee, Arkansas, or Mississippi.

The allotments didn't cause the main reduction in cotton yields, though. Bad weather in many cases, and heavy insect damage in most sections cut yields so that farmers grew only about 10,000,000 bales of cotton, much less than our usual needs. Most of the 1948 and 1949 loan cotton has moved into trade. We need a cotton crop in 1951 to avoid a cotton shortage. Until Government can control the weather, it can't control crop production.

Commentators have a lot to say about Government losses on price-support programs. Some of it is true. Part may be easily misinterpreted.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C., October 4, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: We have tabulated the information on the number of farmers who received cotton-acreage allotments of less than 5 acres which you requested in our recent telephone conversation and your note of September 26.

A summary of this information taken from the letters published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 26, July 31, September 22, and September 23 shows the following:

Number of allotments of less than 5 acres reported	22,145
Those who will grow no cotton:	
Number	4,453
Percent	20
Those who will quit farming:	
Number	878
Percent	4

I am returning the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS and am enclosing the listing sheets as you may be interested in reviewing the individual items.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER W. WILCOX,
Senior Specialist, Agriculture, Legislative Reference Service.

Name of letter writer	Number of allotments less than 5 acres	Percent will grow no cotton	Number will grow no cotton	Percent will quit farming own farm	Number will quit farming own farm
F. P. Martin, d. Congressional Record, July 26, 1950, p. 11304	170	95	162	0	0
R. J. Arnold, ibid	76	5	4	0	0
T. Shelby Oakes, ibid., p. 11305	272	5.5	15	0	0
Buell E. Wright, ibid	266	50–60	[1] 146	20	[1] 53
Bert N. Brumfield, ibid	154	10	15	(2)	(3)
Murphy J. Burch, ibid	444	25	111	2	9
R. E. Hoffman, ibid., pp. 11305–11306	186	25	47	10	19
Ray S. McEntire, ibid., p. 11306	60	75	45	0	0
F. W. Bolin and C. Riley Brown, ibid	191	15	28	52	100
Woodrow W. Booth, ibid	300	50	150	0	0
E. N. McCall, ibid	478	52	250	5	24
S. C. Plott, ibid., pp. 11306–11307	226	10	22	11	25
A. H. Miller, ibid., p. 11307	408	60	245	2	8
M. L. Bostick, ibid	600	8	50	0	0
Green, Fred J., ibid	43	58	25	0	0
Bernard H. Clark, ibid	12	66	8	0	0
Fred K. Roberts, ibid	540	19	100	5	25
T. W. Garriss, ibid	267	9	25	0	0
G. R. Fulbright, ibid	940	11	100	(4)	(4)
R. O. Fearrington, ibid	857	25	214	(4)	(4)
Mallie Stott, ibid	1,389	11	[5] 150	14	20
W. P. House, ibid	1,151	13	150	(4)	(4)
F. W. Young, ibid	258	50	129	0	0
T. G. Norris, d. Congressional Record, Sept. 22, 1950, p. 15654	628	11	70	0	0
Vernon L. Whittle, ibid	345	22	75	58	200
Herman L. Hales, ibid	943	5	47	2	19
C. Howard Treece, ibid	204	8	16	0	0
O. W. Barnett, ibid	202	10	20	(4)	(4)
J. D. Stephens, ibid	288	5	15	4	12

Name of letter writer	Number of allotments less than 5 acres	Percent will grow no cotton	Number will grow no cotton	Percent will quit farming own farm	Number will quit farming own farm
Ray A. Waters, ibid, p. 15655	84	20	17	5	4
Arthur R. Johnson, ibid	367	25	92	0	0
Billy H. Reynolds, ibid	30	67	20	17	5
Lealdon Smith, ibid	138	0	0	0	0
Max G. Sallings, ibid, pp. 15655-15656	100	1	1	2	2
William M. Belcher, ibid., p. 15656	35	29	10	0	0
Carl E. Teeter (Maricopa County) also, for the State of Arizona, ibid., pp. 15656-15657 (letter to Hon. Murdock)	55 185	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
J. A. Sorenson, ibid., p. 15657	8	50	4	25	2
Robert E. Turner, ibid	282	18	50	0	0
Emory Hunt, ibid	172	35	66	6	10
Fred W. Barber, ibid	157	32	50	(6)	(7)
Clayton A. Burriss, ibid	168	26	43	12	20
Roy F. Jones, ibid	38	66	25	13	5
R. V. Riekey, ibid	84	30	25	(4)	(4)
John A. King, ibid	81	75	61	0	0
Frank Wells, ibid	140	25	35	(4)	(4)
T. M. Minchew, ibid	303	25	100	0	0
W. H. Huddleston, ibid	63	32	20	16	10
Alex Long, ibid	52	15	8	5	3
Joe B. Moran, ibid	75	20	15	5	4
B. P. McWhirter, ibid	108	25	27	0	0
John L. Binendnine, d. Congressional Record, Sept. 22, 1950, p. 15660	76	10	8	0	0
Ranell Lowman, ibid	51	50	26	10	5
Marion M. Shivers, ibid	132	50	66	(4)	(4)
Q. D. Wilson, ibid	473	5	25	0	0
Roy L. O'Brien, ibid	114	22	25	13	15
E. D. Dixon, ibid	138	5	7	(4)	(4)
John L. Hays, ibid	1	0	0	0	0
James B. Stewart, ibid	18	0	0	0	0
Berto J. Ourso, ibid	162	31	50	0	0
Hugh G. Edgerton, ibid	32	97	31	0	0
John H. George, ibid	306	10-15	40	(4)	(4)
Waldo P. O'Neal, ibid	96	26	25	0	0
Laura Mae Hammer, ibid	4	100	4	25	1
Alvara B. Nance, ibid., p. 15663	18	44	8	17	3
Bill E. Fisher, ibid	56	50	28	0	0
A. B. Duke, ibid	154	25-30	43	(8)	(9)
U. Ozel Cox, ibid	80	0	0	None	None
Gus Harris, ibid., p. 15664	670	7.5	50	3.7	25
Anonymous, ibid	170	23.5	40	11.7	20
De Kalb County PMA Committee, ibid	95	31.6	30	None	None
Jack Collins, ibid	116	15	17	None	None
F. K. Wright, ibid	34	21	7	None	None
Charles E. Kell, ibid	16	10	2	10	2
G. B. Fowler, ibid., p. 15665	1,146	22	250	(4)	(4)
B. T. Lake, ibid	350	5	18	5	18
F. W. Young, ibid	258	50	129	0	0
W. W. Hankins, Jr., ibid	12	0	0	0	0
Lucille A. Bass, ibid., p. 15666	15	0	0	0	0
W. P. House, d. Congressional Record, Sept. 22, 1950, p. 15666	1,151	13	150	(4)	(4)
George H. Carter, ibid., Sept. 23, 1950, p. 15909	12	0	0	0	0
Cline T. Young, ibid., p. 15910	157	30	47	10	16
P. L. Barksdale, ibid	192	8	15	0	0
Carl E. Lively, ibid	129	9	11	(4)	(4)
C. H. Teal, ibid	1	100	1	0	0
Alva E. Sanders, ibid	264	19	50	38	100
Demp Kearney, ibid., p. 15912	7	100	5 7	0	0
James M. Ratliff, ibid., pp. 15912-13	56	35.7	20	0	0
A. J. Peters, ibid., p. 15913	115	75	86	5	6
Bennett P. Haman, ibid., p. 15915	33	0	0	.5	0
H. R. Hill, ibid., p. 15916	250	10	25	30-40	88
T. Shelby Oakes, d. Congressional Record, July 31, 1950, pp. 11590-11591	272	6	15	0	0
Summary: Number of allotments	22,145	20	4,453	4	878

[1] Approximate.
[2] Very small percentage.
[3] Very small number.
[4] Not given.
[5] Estimated.
[6] Slight.
[7] Very few.
[8] Small percentage.
[9] A few.

Source: Letters to Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH, daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 26, 1931, Sept. 22, 23, 1950. Compiled by Warren W. Scott, Legislative Reference Service, Economics Section, Library of Congress, Oct. 3, 1950.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, November 21, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This replies to your inquiry of November 6 with reference to changing price-support legislation to require a farmer to carry out conservation practices in order to be eligible for Government price support.

In the statement of April 7, 1949, on the general farm program before a joint session of the Senate and House Agricultural Committees, one of the conditions recommended on an eligibility for price support was the observance of minimum and sound soil-conservation practices. It is recognized that such a requirement would present certain administrative difficulties and additional costs of administration, but it is believed that if the requirements are flexible to permit local adaptations to meet local conditions, such a requirement would advance the over-all objectives of a sound farm program.

Further consideration should be given to the provision in future agricultural legislation.

Sincerely yours,
C. J. MCCORMICK,
Under Secretary.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Columbia, S. C., November 20, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I thank you very much for sending me copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of September 22 and 23, 1950. You have certainly gone into the cotton-allotment problem very thoroughly.

For your information I find conditions in South Carolina very much like you describe them in your State and we do hope something can be done to straighten out allotment messes when they are reimposed on the cotton farmers.

Very truly yours,
ROY JONES,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
CITY OF KILGORE, TEX.,
September 30, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LINDLEY: Enclosed is a photo copy of a cotton notice to Tommie N. Nixon, who resides near Kilgore, which is self-explanatory.

I think it a shame and disgrace to penalize this man—or any other person of like status—for growing three bales of cotton on a little old worn-out east Texas farm, especially in the face of such a short cotton crop throughout the Nation this year, and with a big demand for cotton. We here in Kilgore can't buy sheets for our new hospital because of shortages of sheets on the market.

I have known Tommie for 30 years or more. During all these years he has been trying to eke out a living raising whatever crops and stock he could in order to live—not make money. He lives outside the oil field and has no income from that source. As I understand it, he didn't grow any cotton for perhaps 1 or 2 years and for that reason was refused a quota for this year.

In view of the fact there is every indication now there will be no restrictions on planting cotton in 1951; the short crop this year, and, the high cost of living for these poor farmers, I see no reason why these restrictions can't be lifted now and give these people the relief so badly needed.

What can you do about it now?

Regards and best wishes.

Sincerely,
ROY H. LAIRD.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICUTURE,
Washington, D. C., November 15, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of October 30, 1950, with which you returned our letter to you, dated October 19, regarding overplanted cotton farms.

The statements made by "Roy" on the bottom of our letter have been observed and it is certainly true that there is need for additional cotton production as stated in the press release issued October 3, 1950, in connection with the announcement that acreage allotments and marketing quotas would not be in effect on the 1951 crop of cotton, a copy of which is enclosed. In general, the press release explains the need for at least a 16,000,000-bale crop of cotton next year.

You will observe that in the last paragraph of our letter of October 19, 1950, the condition under which marketing quotas could be terminated under the legislation was set forth.

Sincerely yours,
C. J. MCCORMACK,
Under Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., October 23, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of October 10, 1950, copies of which you addressed to Mr. Ralph S. Trigg, Administrator, and Mr. Frank K. Woolley, Deputy Administrator, Production and Marketing Administration, and with which you enclosed a letter from Mr. Roy H. Laird, Kilgore, Tex.

Cotton acreage allotments and marketing quotas for 1950 were established under the authority of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. This legislation provides that the farm marketing quota for cotton shall be the actual production of the acreage planted to cotton on the farm less the farm marketing excess. The farm marketing excess is the normal production of that acreage planted to cotton on the farm which is in excess of the farm acreage allotment. If the overplanted acreage is not adjusted to the farm acreage allotment within a reasonable period, the farm marketing excess produced on the farm will be subject to penalty at a rate equal to 50 percent of the parity price for cotton as of June 15, or 15.5 cents per pound.

The farm marketing excess will in no case be larger than the normal yield per acre times the acreage planted in excess of the allotment. If the actual yield is less than the normal yield, and the producer establishes such fact to the satisfaction of the Production and Marketing Administration county committee, the farm marketing excess will be reduced to the amount by which the total production on the farm exceeds the normal yield times the allotment. In cases such as the one referred to in Mr. Laird's letter where no allotment is established for the farm, if the producer establishes, within 30 days after harvest is completed, that the actual production on the farm is less than the normal production of the acreage planted to cotton on the farm, the producer may avoid the payment of a part of the penalty or may receive a refund of a portion of the penalty previously paid.

There is no authority in the legislation for waiving the acreage adjustment provision, except by suspension or termination of marketing quotas for the 1950 crop. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized by the act to terminate or increase a national marketing quota when such action is found necessary to meet a national emergency or a material increase in export demand for the commodity. However, the large majority of cotton farmers who planted in excess of their farm allotments and who intended to adjust the planted acreage to their farm allotments have already made such adjustments. Others have paid a penalty on their excess acreage and have harvested or will harvest the cotton from this acreage. The termination of the national marketing quota for the 1950 crop of cotton, at this time, therefore, would add no appreciable amount of cotton to the production of 1950. Consequently, it is our opinion that cotton-marketing quotas for the 1950 crop year should not be terminated.

Sincerely yours,

K. T. HUTCHINSON,
Assistant Secretary.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
College Station, Tex., November 6, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: As requested in your memorandum of October 28, I am returning the copy of correspondence from the Honorable K. T. Hutchinson, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, together with other attachments.

As outlined in my letter of October 3 and as restated in the letter of October 23 from the Assistant Secretary, it is felt that marketing quotas on the 1950 crop should not be suspended or terminated at this time. Mr. Nixen should arrange to meet with his local PMA county committee for the purpose of paying the marketing quota penalty described on Form MQ-93-Cotton.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

BIG SANDY, TEX., *November 1, 1950.*

Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Gladewater, Tex.

DEAR LINDLEY: I am writing to explain the position I am in as a farmer. I have a farm leased in which there are 251 acres. This farm belongs to J. Press Davis. I moved on this farm in the fall of 1947. The place hadn't been farmed in several years. The following year I planted 20 acres of cotton, 10 acres of corn, and some small grain. My peanut allotment was zero. This year they allowed me 4.2 acres of cotton and no peanuts. I planted the cotton, knowing that I couldn't make much more than enough to pay my expenses and rent for the farm in which is $175. I planted 12.4 acres of peanuts. When they came to measure my crop I told them that I planted those peanuts at my own risk, but they determined to measure them anyway.

On October 23, 1950, Mr. Lewis E. Stracener, administration officer, sent a man out to see me about my peanuts. He asked me if I had tried to sell them, or if I was going to sell them. I told him I was if I could. Then I went up to talk to Mr. Stracener. He told me there would be a penalty of 5.4 cents per pound, in which would be half or more than I would get out of the peanuts.

I am a veteran of World War II. I thought freedom was what we were fighting for, but when they allowed me 4.2 acres of cotton to make a living for my wife and two children I felt that my freedom was gone.

After returning from the service I borrowed money from the FHA to buy some cattle and a tractor in which I still owe some on this debt.

The point is, if I can't plant but 4.2 acres of cotton I'll just have to quit and sell my cattle and tractor to get out of debt.

I believe since you being raised in east Texas, you know what I am up against, but I feel that there is some that don't.

That is about all I have to say except I would like very much to continue farming.

Yours very truly,

HOWARD M. SMITH.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] is recognized.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very important that this amendment be adopted. It does not add anything to the over-all expenditure. I state, however, that the $1,000,000 is a limitation on the appropriation, but in my opinion the farmers feel so strongly about this that the farmers at least in my territory would be glad to contribute part of the cost, if necessary.

Another point in favor of having this measuring done is that there is a probability of more confusion than there was the last time controls were imposed. I might say, incidentally, that when inequities do occur it usually affects the small farmer to a greater extent for he does not keep the complete records that the larger farmer does.

I think that in order to protect the small farmer we should have this acreage measured, because we all do know that we are going to have limitations and crop controls put on in some future year, and I think it is very important that we do authorize this work to be done.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wish to make clear in reference to the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], that I am not in agreement to furnishing any more money than is in the fund now when I agreed that $1,000,000 of this $8,300,000 be expended for this purpose. I am supporting the amendment on that basis, but I want it to appear in the RECORD that I am not suggesting that we go over to the Senate and get this $8,300,000 increased.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. In this amendment here we are not asking any additional money at this time.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is right and that is my reason for agreeing to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT].

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, another reason not heretofore advanced in this debate for adoption of this amendment is that the individual farmers are entitled to a better record than those afforded by BAE figures, which are based upon inaccurate gin reports and poor estimations. Cotton acreage is often afforded a county, based upon gin records, to which the county is not entitled. In such instances the acreage has been wrongfully taken from another county. There are many reasons why gin reports cannot be considered as good estimates. Some acreage in the same field will produce considerably more cotton than adjoining acreage.

It is not the large farmer who is so adversely affected without actual cotton acreage records; because as has been brought out here before, it is not difficult for him to prove the exact number of acres that he had planted to cotton; it is the small cotton farmer, the one-horse cotton farmer, so to speak, who is drastically affected.

Since it now appears that no Member will oppose the amendment, I will only take enough additional time to state that actual cotton acreage records should be established during these years that no controls are in force in order that every farmer may know his entitlement in case of future controls.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recognized to conclude the debate.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I did not ask for time; I did not understand that any time was reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses, including library membership fees or dues in organizations which issue publications to members only or to members at a lower price than to others, payment for which may be made in advance; not to exceed $20,000 for expenditures authorized by section 602 of the Organic Act of 1944 (12 U. S. C. 833); $300,000, together with not to exceed $2,325,000 of receipts from Farm Credit agencies, to be advanced to this appropriation, to cover the cost of supervision, facilities, examinations, and other services rendered to such agencies; $2,625,000.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time to briefly discuss an item under the

Farm Credit Administration program which was quite severely cut by the committee. I am not going to offer an amendment to increase the amount, but I do want to call the attention of the committee to the fact the entire cut which is made in the Farm Credit Administration appropriation of $280,000 falls on one division of the Farm Credit Administration, the cooperative research and service organization. That item as it came from the budget called for $580,000 and it has been reduced by the committee to $300,000 or a cut of about 48 percent. I do not know how familiar the membership may be with the work which has been done by the cooperative research and service organization, but I want to briefly call attention to the history of that organization and refer to the work it has done.

The Cooperative Research and Service Division was set up under the Cooperative Marketing Act of 1926. The Agricultural Marketing Act of 1929 which set up the Federal Farm Board was largely based upon the cooperative marketing of farm products, and under its provisions additional duties were assigned to this Division. During the intervening years it has rendered splendid service to farmers' cooperative organizations, especially the local cooperatives which comprise 9,500 of the 10,000 farm marketing and purchasing cooperatives in this country. These local cooperatives are composed in the main of operators of family farms and the Division's work and activity has been to assist these farmers to utilize cooperatives in meeting their farm-business problems, particularly in the marketing of their products.

I am a strong believer in the value of these local cooperatives which have done much to equalize the family farmers' competitive position. In assisting them we are helping farmers to help themselves, and the total amount of money appropriated throughout the years for this agency amounts to practically nothing when compared with the over-all appropriations for the Department of Agriculture.

While I do not intend to offer an amendment to restore this amount, I would like to call attention to the fact that this cut of 48 percent is one of the most severe in the bill and compares with a reduction of approximately 10 percent in the other research funds of the Department. I believe that the value of this research to farmers compares most favorably with that of the other research activities of the Department and feel that if 10 percent is considered a fair reduction in the appropriations for other research activities that no greater percentage should be applied to this item.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We all recognize the fact that as we go through the innumerable items contained in this bill perhaps the committee does make mistakes one way or the other. I am referring now to the action of the subcommittee.

Mr. HOPE. Yes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Here is one item in the bill that we may have cut too deeply. I have suggested to gentlemen who have approached me on this subject that they make their case before the other body, and then we can discuss the matter further in conference if the other body decides to increase what we have allowed here.

Mr. HOPE. I thank my good friend very much. I am entirely agreeable to the suggestion which he has just made. I know that if there is further opportunity to consider the matter he will approach it in his usual spirit of fairness and will consider the question from the able and sympathetic viewpoint in which he deals with all legislative problems.

I hope that the cooperative organizations which are interested will go before the Senate committee and make out their case, and if the Senate does increase the amount that the members of the conference committee will be inclined to give consideration to that increase on its merits.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I want to say that some times in the heat of discussion we frequently overlook some things, but I want to say that there is no abler man in the House of Representatives than the gentleman from Kansas, and there is no man in the Congress that I know who knows more about the operation of agriculture and who gives a fairer approach to the subject than the gentleman from Kansas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. I think the confidence that the membership generally has in the gentleman is not exceeded by what they have in anybody else in the House, and I am glad to have this statement on this particular issue presented. As I have said many times, we cannot vouch for the accuracy of these decisions but we can give reasons. In regard to this particular item, all of the activities of the Farm Credit Administration are done for various members of the Farm Credit System, but in each case the charges are assessed back to the organization. It is only in regard to the cooperatives that the entire cost is paid by appropriation out of the Treasury. No charge is made to them for any of the work. The Farm Credit Administration provides the co-ops with professional and technical assistance, research facilities, and so on. The purpose of the committee, insofar as I understand it, was that we thought in regard to cooperatives it might be wise for them to begin to contribute to some extent toward the cost of these services, since in regard to all other services, all the charges are paid by member organizations. That has been the position of the committee. Certainly there is no prejudice on the part of the committee. If the amount of the cut is too severe, we will be glad to reconsider it. But, in view of the very fine attitude and the confidence I have in the gentleman from Kansas, I wanted to explain our position and say that we will be glad at any time to go into the matter with anyone who may have a different idea about it.

Mr. HOPE. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi most sincerely for his kind references. I appreciate them, especially coming from him. I am glad also to have the information which the gentleman gives me with respect to what the committee had in mind in reducing this appropriation. While I realize that the other expenditures of the Farm Credit Administration are paid for by assessments against the lending institutions under its supervision, I do not believe that such a rule could very well be applied to this activity. In the first place it is generally conceded that agricultural research activities are general in their scope and cannot very well be charged against any particular group or organization. That is true of all of our research activities as far as I know. In the second place this activity is quite similar to studies made by the Department of Commerce for business and industry which are made out of appropriated funds. In the third place the chief beneficiaries of this work have been the small local cooperatives which are not in a position to pay for this service even if some equitable method of apportioning the charges could be worked out. For these and other reasons I do not believe that the suggestion which has been made that this work be compensated for by cooperative organizations is a proper or a practical approach to the matter.

Let me report that because I have such great confidence in this subcommittee, which has brought in a splendid bill, I am simply calling attention to this situation with the thought that the cooperative organizations which are interested in this service will appear before the Senate Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. I believe they can make a strong case for an increase above the amount carried in the House bill. In the even that the item is increased by the Senate I feel certain that the distinguished chairman and the other members of the House subcommittee will give the matter due and proper consideration. That is all I ask.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, the deduction of $280,000 from the $580,000 portion of the funds appropriated for the Farm Credit Administration, proposed by the House Appropriations Committee, falls entirely on the Cooperative Research and Service Division of that agency.

There has been no criticism of the manner in which the staff of the Division has discharged its duties through the years. On the contrary, it has had many words of commendation from officers of farmers' cooperatives and Members of Congress. Neither has the Division expended any great amount of public funds. Its budget request for this year is only $580,000 compared with

many millions approved for other agricultural programs of no greater importance than assistance to self-help organizations such as cooperatives.

The heavy cut of 48 percent for research for farmer cooperatives is out of all proportion to the statement of the House Committee Report that research funds in the Department should "under existing circumstances, be reduced by approximately 10 percent." A reasonable cut could be borne, but this cut would impair the ability of the Farm Credit Administration to carry out its basic functions in helping farmers with their cooperatives.

The statement of the committee appears to be predicated on a misunderstanding of the program of the Cooperative Research and Service Division. It is not a service agency for individual cooperatives or for other divisions of the Farm Credit Administration. Its research is generally of a broad character, and the results are useful to all cooperatives performing the functions studied, and to non-cooperatives as well. Only a part of the work of the Division during the past year was devoted to service activities for cooperatives. The remainder was research on the common problems of many cooperatives, other producers and distributors on service and educational work, a small part of the total with groups of farmers planning organization, or with small cooperatives with little financial strength.

The great majority of farmer cooperatives are small, local organizations. Perhaps 500 marketing and purchasing associations could be classified as large-scale; that is, their net worth is $1,000,000 or more. The other 9,500, for the most part, have no more than enough working capital to carry on their business operations.

Even assuming that cooperatives could pay part of the cost of research service, there is no machinery under which such funds could be collected. This would require special legislation and it would take a considerable period to work out any program to help continue the work of the agency under this basis. In the meantime, the staff would be scattered and the trained personnel now available would be gone, as there are no funds to carry on this work other than those provided by the appropriation.

The proposed cut of 48 percent for research, service, and educational work for cooperatives operated by farmers would be in opposition to the long record of Congresses favorable to helping farmers to help themselves, and to the preservation of the family-farm type of agriculture which we hold basis to our democratic economic and social system.

This list of functions is illustrative of the tasks performed, but is not all-inclusive, even though it covers a wide range of activities. Staff members of the division were able to directly assist the agencies of Government on special problems confronting cooperatives, or provide information on cooperative operations of direct assistance to the war agencies.

The first group of functions includes those aiding the war effort directly:

At the request of General Arnold, head of the Army Air Corps, the livestock and wool section of the division organized State shearing committees who assisted in attaining an annual production of 5,000,000 shearlings to make flying suits for military aviators.

In cooperation with State extension services and cooperative associations, the division set up schools in 17 States to train sheep shearers, mostly from future farmer and 4-H Clubs, who replaced a large number of regular sheep shearers who were inducted into the Armed Forces.

Surveyed wool-storage facilities at eastern points to determine space available for storage of wool stockpile.

At the request of Gen. Theron T. Weaver, of the War Department, hide-conservation schools at 20 packing plants over the country were conducted to train unskilled butchers in order to reduce cuts and scars on hides as a part of the leather-conservation program.

Conducted experiments in baling wool with cotton presses to demonstrate the amount of saving which could be made in burlap and transportation space by shipment in bales rather than in bags.

Gave assistance in the organization of agricultural transportation pools and National, State, and county transportation committees.

Assembled comparative freight rates and factual transportation information to determine most advantageous locations for grain storage and distributing facilities.

Assisted in the allocation of materials for the manufacture of new equipment and repair of needed rail, highway, and waterway equipment for the transportation of agricultural products and farm supplies.

Submitted a traffic program for conservation of tires, delivery equipment, and labor in moving farm supplies to farmers to the Department of Agriculture Committee on Conservation of Trucks and Tires for Agricultural Transportation.

A study was made of methods used by purchasing cooperatives to help farmers conserve their farm machinery and equipment during the war emergency.

Considerable effort was devoted to work with the Office of Agricultural Defense Relations on plans to conserve rubber and other scarce materials through more efficient assembling of milk and cream.

Early in World War II, the importance of adequate supplies of fats and oils was recognized. Because of previous studies and knowledge of the industry, the division was asked to make a national survey of the crushing capacity and location of oil mills in the United States. The results of this study made it possible to use existing capacity far more efficiently.

Work in the manpower field included studies of the possibilities of using manpower more efficiently in processing plants, study of labor relations in these plants, participation in training-within-industry programs for cooperatives jointly sponsored by the War Manpower Commission and banks for cooperatives. Attention was given to problems of employee recruitment, replacement, deferment, and wages.

Worked with cooperative associations to increase the efficiency of milk assembly by trucks.

Surveyed the possibilities for dehydration of fruits and vegetables by cooperatives and assisted cooperatives in developing dehydration operations as a part of the war effort.

Information was prepared on methods of training cooperatives' employees for wartime efficiency.

Specific, detailed studies were made of cooperatives to develop ways for them to meet war conditions, and to determine how they might make the greatest contribution to the war effort. These detailed works were conducted in Alabama, Indiana, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Kansas, Idaho, Washington, the Tennessee Valley Authority area, and the fifth farm credit district.

Secured gasoline, tires, and trucks for sheep-shearing crews in the West and Middle West when these items were originally denied by OPA.

Secured steel for the manufacture of sheep-shearing machines and blades after the commercial companies manufacturing these items had failed to secure an allocation of steel from the War Production Board.

The second group of functions includes those aiding in the war effort by giving direct assistance to agencies of the Government:

Assisted in bringing to the attention of selective-service officials contributions to the war effort of key employees of cooperatives in connection with their possible deferment.

The Frozen Food Locker Section was designated as the sole agency in the Department of Agriculture to pass on applications for new construction and expansion of locker plants, and to make recommendations to the WPB regarding allocations.

Furnished cost, margin, and price data to the OPA and wartime agencies relative to poultry products.

At the request of the Office of Agricultural War Relations studies were made and reports prepared on the estimated numbers and kinds of new containers and material needed for fresh fruits and vegetables in 1942, new and second-hand bags necessary for storage and shipment of raw sugar produced in 1943, and fabrics required for bags and other packaging for agricultural products and for farm supplies in 1942.

Assisted the Office of Agricultural Defense Relations on problems of packaging requirements for feed and fertilizer.

Prepared price and other related information on certain fertilizer materials for the Department of Labor and Office of Price Administration.

Served on a USDA subcommittee charged with developing a rationing program for nitrogen fertilizer.

Assistance was given to UNRRA and various agencies in the USDA on prob-

lems relating to cooperative purchasing of farm supplies.

At the request of the Surplus Marketing Administration, the Office of Agricultural Defense Relations, the Office of Production Management, the Dairy Section made studies to determine the economic soundness of establishing milk plants to be financed with lend-lease funds.

Representatives of the Dairy Section of the Division served on the committees establishing production goals for the dairy industry. Many other members of the staff served on production goal committees relative to other commodities.

Estimates were prepared for the Office of Defense Transportation and the Office of Price Administration on the quantities of petroleum handled by farmer cooperatives in 1942.

Assistance was rendered to the Department of Agriculture relative to cases involving fair application of price control programs.

Assistance was given to WPB through ascertaining the burlap requirements of rice and dry-bean cooperatives, and muslin requirements of tobacco cooperatives.

Functions of the Division aiding the war effort through assistance to the cooperatives:

Cataloged and studied each official order affecting livestock, meats and wool, and made representation to the respective war agency whenever it appeared that such order would work a hardship on cooperatives or other businesses.

Conducted a survey for the War Production Board and Office of Agricultural War Relations on all oilseed processing capacity, cooperative and otherwise, in the United States as a basis of allocation of steel in plant construction. This survey was used in the development of the whole program of plant construction to increase capacity of oilseed processing plants in 1942.

Prepared a news letter at intervals of approximately 2 weeks interpreting war orders and advising cooperatives regarding Selective Service orders, OPA regulations, and WPB orders.

Work was carried on with farmers' cooperative associations and others to assist them with wartime problems arising particularly from shortages of feed, labor, credit, and equipment—both farm and plant—in the poultry field.

Studied possibilities of greater farm production through neighborhood cooperation.

Information was developed for purchasing associations on the wartime importance of retail credit controls.

Analysis was made of the methods used by purchasing associations to meet urgent packaging problems due to shortages of burlap and other customary packaging materials.

Information was prepared and presented to cooperative managers on methods of maintaining organizational efficiency in wartime.

Material was prepared and distributed to the United States purchasing cooperatives on the experiences of British purchasing cooperatives which had been operating for several years under war conditions.

Assistance was given to cooperatives manufacturing feed in acquiring feed manufacturing facilities to help meet the critical feed shortage conditions.

Assistance was given to several large-scale cooperative purchasing associations in formulating postwar readjustment plans.

At the request of a number of State colleges of agriculture, advisory guidance was rendered to numerous dairy cooperatives through which savings were realized in both materials and manpower.

Assistance was rendered to tobacco cooperatives in connection with their problems arising from OPA regulations.

Helped to keep officials of banks for cooperatives informed regarding new regulations and orders issued from time to time. Also upon request, checked up on priority applications filed by cooperatives on projects being financed by the banks for cooperatives.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Senate will restore these funds and that the House conferees will accept the recommendations of the Senate.

[Mr. CANNON addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think the cooperatives of this country deeply appreciate the fact that they have as able a spokesman as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]. I concur in the statements he has made. The Cooperative Marketing Act of 1926 provided that that research and service facilities should be provided for farmers' cooperative association. As a result the Cooperative Research and Service Division was formed and is now an operating division of the Farm Credit Administration. During the 1951 fiscal year $585,000 was appropriated for this Division. The Bureau of the Budget estimated that $580,000 would be required for this program during fiscal 1952 and although the committee report suggests that research funds for the Department of Agriculture "should be reduced by approximately 10 percent," only $300,000 has been allotted to this program or a reduction of approximately 48 percent. It would seem that this is out of proportion to the reduction made in the funds for other agencies and would definitely have a crippling effect on a program that means so much to farmer cooperatives.

It has been suggested that the cost of this research should be paid by benefited cooperatives. While there may be merit to this proposal it would be difficult to assess the costs of the research that benefits a large group of cooperatives in varying degrees. If a business organization pays the entire cost of a research program it regards the results as its own property and is not required to make the results available to the general public as a Government agency is required to do. Traditionally research and education have been Government functions in America. This is particularly true when it affects groups of people who are not in a position to conduct their own research work. Most farmers and farmers' cooperatives are not in a position to do this work. Farmers looks to their cooperatives for help in solving their marketing problems and this Division has done good work in studying the problem and passing on the results of their research to all farmer cooperatives.

Studies made by this division on agriculture cooperatives are similar to the studies made by the Department of Commerce for business and industry and which are carried on with funds appropriated by the Congress. If one group should have the benefit of Government help for these studies, who is to say that they should be denied to another segment of our economy. If it is the will of the Congress, that Government research service should be paid by the groups benefited it would require special legislation under which such funds could be collected. It would take time to work out a program to continue the work of the agency under such a plan and in the meantime the staff would be scattered and trained personnel now available would look elsewhere for work since there are no other funds provided to carry on this work except by this appropriation.

During normal years the studies made by the Cooperative Research and Service Division are primarily for cooperatives to improve their operations and management. During World War II, studies were carried on that were valuable to all industry and to the defense agencies. Much the same program can again be carried on during this emergency. As in World War II, this Division can again help mobilize the cooperatives so that there will be full cooperation by this organized group. We feel that this agency should expect to have its appropriation reduced on the same basis as the other research agencies of the Department, however, the proposed cut of 48 percent is too drastic. This cut would be in opposition to the record of Congress that has been favorable to the program of helping farmers help themselves. Since most farmer cooperatives are made up of the family type farmer, which the Congress has time and again indicated it desired to help, this reduction is of particular harm to that group.

(Mr. MARSHALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; travel expenses, including examination of estimates for appropriations in the field; stationery, supplies, materials, and equipment; freight, express, and drayage charges; advertising, communication service, postage, washing towels, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of Department of Agriculture, $2,157,200, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the budget for the current fiscal year for such services and expenses, which several amounts or portions

thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $109,280, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: On page 44, line 14, strike out "$2,157,200" and insert "$2,082,200."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes, so that I can go into this subject thoroughly.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 10 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will take only 3 percent out of the item affecting directly the immediate office of the Secretary.

I think it would be only good business to show to the gentlemen at the top of this vast organization of the Department of Agriculture, with more than 60,000 employees, that they themselves in that immediate office must try to do a little economizing. I can show the House, and I intend to do so, just where $75,000 can easily be taken out of this item without harm in any way.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is not this one of the offices that are padded with an enormous number of high-priced folks?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is what I want to bring out.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that the Office of the Secretary could well operate on a maximum of $2,082,200 for the next fiscal year. Consequently, I am offering an amendment to reduce the figure in the bill from $2,157,200 by $75,000. I would like to point out several places where there seems to be an excess of high-priced personnel. Please keep in mind that the Secretary does also have access to the services of personnel in the numerous bureaus under his jurisdiction. I would also like to call your attention to a breakdown which I have analyzed for the 1952 request of the immediate office of the Secretary. We note here that the Secretary of Agriculture as a Cabinet officer receives a salary of $22,500. He has an Under Secretary who is paid $17,500. There is one Assistant Secretary of Agriculture who is paid $15,000 per year. An executive assistant to the Secretary receives $11,400. No one can really find much fault with the four top positions in the Secretary's immediate office but as we go down the list we find that there are six additional assistants to the Secretary, each of whom average $10,475 per year. We also find an Administrator of the land and water resources program who is paid $11,000. There is an agricultural economist receiving $11,400. As we scrutinize a little further 11 other positions known as administrative officers, each of whom receive about $8,800 per year are listed and to complete the bill there are six so-called agriculturists who are paid better than $9,000 each. In addition to these 24 top jobs in the Secretary's immediate office we have 48 minor positions from $3,900 up. The total amount requested for the Secretary's immediate office is $520,000.

Let us scan another Division—Personnel Administration and Service. Here the top positions are not nearly as numerous, but we do have 100 positions in that Division of the Secretary's office ranging from $11,400 for the Director of Personnel down to the compensation for clerical workers. It is interesting to note here that there are two assistant directors of personnel at $10,000 each. We have 7 chiefs of divisions in this part of the Secretary's office who are paid $9,400 each—2 assistant chiefs receiving $8,400 each—11 chiefs of sections drawing from $7,600 to $8,600. I will not enumerate the others, but will now turn to the Budget office, which is also a small division of the Secretary's office. We find the Director of Finance and Budget receiving $11,400—and I will say, at this point, that I think that the present occupant of this position is well worth that salary. But I would suggest that perhaps he has at least one too many assistant directors of finance. I note he has four such assistant directors listed here at $9,400 each. Here, again, we find seven chiefs of divisions each being paid in the neighborhood of $8,400. We also find eight chiefs of sections receiving in the neighborhood of $6,800 each. That particular Division of the Secretary's office has 126 positions, and 16 of those positions pay $8,000 or over each.

We will now turn to the division in the Secretary's office known as General Operations, where there are 102 positions. The Director of Plant and Operations receives $10,750. He has three assistant directors under him receiving on an average $8,750. We find the usual number of chiefs of divisions, but one thing in particular stands out which I think could be studied carefully—the Real Estate Division in this particular part of the Secretary's office has a chief—an administrative officer, two administrative assistants and four architectural engineers—the latter receiving on an average about $6,100 per annum. Just why it should be necessary to hire that number of architectural engineers, I do not know.

Mr. Chairman, this outline will give some idea as to the number of high-paid positions in the Secretary's office—and I say high paid when I think of the fact that very few people in my district in southwestern Minnesota earn up to $10,000 a year in business or in the professions. Frankly, I question the advisability of the Secretary having, in addition to the three major positions directly under him, six assistants to the Secretary. You would think that one assistant to each of the top four officials would be sufficient. I also question the presence of four agriculturists in the Land and Water Resources Division. Certainly it seems that we should not have to spend $124,700 in that particular little division in the Secretary's immediate office when we have the elaborate set-ups that are in some of the major divisions of the Department, such as Soil Conservation Service, which could well handle, it would seem to me, the bulk of that work. I question the need for the numerous chiefs of divisions and chiefs of sections. It makes me wonder just who really does do the work. It would seem that perhaps there should be a division in the Secretary's office devoted to examining ways and means of eliminating useless positions in the entire Department of Agriculture and also within his immediate office.

If we remember that this reduction amounts to only 3 percent and that all of this personnel listed in these sheets I have in my hand represent less than 1 percent of the administrative personnel in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. May I ask the gentleman if it is not true also that the Secretary, if he has an emergency or great pressure in his office, can move people in there, and does he not now have the right under the law to do that?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The Secretary has the right under the law, if I am correct, to transfer funds to the extent of 7 percent from any part of the huge Department of Agriculture to another part where they may be slightly squeezed financially. He needs that elastic provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] has expired.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] on the section dealing with the Farm Credit Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

(Mr. TACKETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made earlier in the day.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recognized to close debate

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, since I have been a Member of the House, one of the most difficult things to defend has always been the office personnel in the city of Washington. It is always popular to cut those things that are a long way from home. I know the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] is motivated by the finest of intentions. But I do want to give you my opinion and my views with regard to the Secretary's office.

The Secretary's office is operating, if this bill is passed, programs totalling approximately $720,000,000 in direct annual appropriations. In addition, in the Department of Agriculture we have the Farmers Home Administration, the International Wheat Agreement operation the foot-and-mouth disease operation, and the rural electrification operation, which require well over a quarter of a billion dollars a year, that are operated through the office of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Since I have been chairman of this committee I have from time to time had serious questions raised as to the operations of various segments of the Department, and each time that has occurred I have had an investigation made, and each time I have had an investigation made I have found many things that needed to be corrected . To whom do we have to look to bring about those corrections and to see that there is proper coordination and improvement in the situation that we have found to exist? We have to look to the offices in the District of Columbia, and particularly the Secretary.

This is no plea for Charles Brannan, as such. I made the closing argument against the Brannan plan when it was before the Congress a year or two ago. I pointed out when they wanted a trial run of the Brannan plan that we had our trial run during the war, and it did not work. But if you are going to have this big operation, it is bad judgment and poor policy not to operate it from the top.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Of course the gentleman knows that all of the big number of bureaus in the Department have top men by the score, from whom Mr. Brannan can secure almost unlimited assistance if he sees fit.

Mr. WHITTEN. This is no attack on the gentleman from Minnesota. I have said that he might be right and I might be wrong, but I want to show the other side of it.

You do not have a single Department of Agriculture. You have a series of bureaus and agencies. You have the Rural Electrification Administration, you have the Bureau of Animal Industry, you have the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and you have the Bureau of Industrial Chemistry, each of them practically independent, and to some extent many of them duplicating each other, as our reports show.

We have the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine. I had an investigation made there a year or two ago, and it disclosed that they had a huge amount of surplus products. Through the Secretary's office I was able to see to it that they sold around $4,000,000 worth of that property, and the money went into the Treasury. That is over and above the amount of property that was turned over to other agencies.

On top of this group of offices and agencies you have the Secretary's office. His office consists of four principal parts: his immediate office, the Office of Personnel, the Office of Budget and Finance, and the Office of Hearing Examiners which has to do with all these milk pricing orders, a very big operation.

You will recall the instance last year when the Secretary asked for three or four Assistant Secretaries. At the time I opposed it, but the record showed that he had about one-sixth as many as the Department of the Interior. Your committee has held this group down. I would like to point out something else.

In connection with the war effort we have called on the various departments to do their best for the war effort. Allotments were contemplated to be made from the national defense set-up to the various departments. I was author of a provision in the third deficiency bill which requires the Department to go ahead and do the war work and to curtail their domestic program to the extent necessary. That task is being assigned to the Secretary of Agriculture. Today we have got to look to the Secretary's office to represent us in matters having to do with beef prices, and all that kind of thing. The Office of the Secretary is the office to which we must look to protect the cause of agriculture and the individual worker in agriculture. His office has a great deal to do with the effort to get sufficient allocations of steel for farm machinery and chemicals for fertilizer. We have got to look to the Secretary's office for all those things. It is not going to be an easy job to do these things. Why, for $75,000, give them an excuse for not doing these things?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. There may be an explanation for this in the Office of the Secretary, but I notice an item for advertising. Is that to advertise the operations of the Department, or what does it entail? And how much money, if it does include that, how much of the amount intended here to be spent is spent by the Secretary for advertising what he is doing in the Department?

Mr. WHITTEN. There is no money in this bill for advertising as such.

Mr. KEATING. But the bill itself uses the word "advertising."

Mr. WHITTEN. Why do all this research work, find solutions to all these problems, and not let the people know what has been done, what can be done, and how they are made available? If there has been some misuse of funds in regard to these operations, I assure the gentleman that I will be the first to try to strike at such abuses.

Mr. KEATING. I am sure the gentleman will, but I am wondering what this particular word "advertising" means in this one item. This is money to be spent and I wonder what that advertising by the Secretary of Agriculture amounted to.

Mr. FOGARTY. As I understand, that is to be used by the Secretary's office in advertising for bids for the purchase of equipment and supplies.

Mr. KEATING. If that is the purpose of the item I would, of course, have no objection. That is what I was trying to find out.

Mr. WHITTEN. For the moment it had escaped me, but as the gentleman from Rhode Island says, it is to be used for advertising for bids.

Mr. KEATING. That kind of advertising is all right. What I object to is the propaganda items for which money is spent.

Mr. WHITTEN. Let me proceed with my statement.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that there are over 40 drawing $9,000 a year and nearly 30 drawing over $10,000 a year in this set-up?

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say that the Congress, has through the Civil Service and the Classification Act, set up the classification of employees. Since I have been a Member, the Congress has raised the salaries. I will hold Charlie Brannan responsible for a lot of things but I will not hold him responsible for the acts of Congress. When it comes to handling the operation of a billion and a half dollars a year, when we give to him the task of seeing that farmers get adequate farm machinery, equipment, fertilizer, and so forth, when we require them to absorb national defense work, I personally do not want to give him something to hide behind by cutting out about $75,000. Since 1940, we have reduced the number of employees by about 240 and we have continuously reduced them. Last year we reduced the number 24. This year we are about $31,000 under the budget.

I certainly believe you will make a mistake if you cut further here, because it is to this office we must look for correction of the things that we find going wrong in the field. That would be true of any other department.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 63, noes 50.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WHITTEN and Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 78, noes 53.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALE: Page 44, line 10, after the word "advertising", insert "of bids."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine.

The question was taken: and on a division (demanded by Mr. HALE) there were—ayes 66, noes 16.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

For necessary expenses for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations and for enabling the Secretary to coordinate and integrate activities of the Department in connection with foreign agricultural work, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only, $600,000.

[Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

(Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, this is an item which has troubled more than the gentleman from Wisconsin and has troubled me as well as this subcommittee and the entire House Committee on Agriculture. I ask your indulgence that I may review the work in the Department of Agriculture ever since 1862 when the Department was organized on foreign agricultural relations. At that time we saw fit to have men in the Department of Agriculture who could investigate or assay the market for agricultural products abroad and the production in other countries. Gradually through the years this function in the Department of Agriculture became useful. In 1930 the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations was formally organized, and that is the appropriation, for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, about which we are now talking.

The gimmick in this thing came with the Reorganization Act of 1939. In that act we made agricultural attachés and commercial attachés agents of the State Department. I know in the popular mind one would think that a foreign agricultural attaché reports back to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan. He does not. He reports back to Secretary of State Acheson. I maintain that that is wrong. Certainly commercial attachés should report back to Secretary of Commerce Sawyer and not to Secretary Sawyer through the Secretary of State—no matter who the Secretary of State might be.

I maintain and from my own personal investigations and observations, I can say that we do not have effective representation for American farmers in foreign countries today. The only office we have in the United States today that really speaks for and looks out for the interest of the American farmer is the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations for which we have fully provided, according to the budget, in this bill, and the foreign agricultural commodity specialists who are paid for by a transfer of some $140,000 from the Research and Marketing Act funds.

You asked me about point 4 and the ECA. There is work being done there. The money has been expended on that. That is a separate consideration. That is expected to be terminated. But we do not want the only ones who represent and fight for American farmers in foreign countries to be abused by striking out this item from the bill. You asked me why these men did not kiss and make up. Heaven only knows the efforts that have been going on ever since we saw the mistakes that were made in the Reorganization Act of 1939 and the efforts that have been going on through the years. The House Committee on Agriculture has been working at it. We are making headway because we are defending those in government who are doing something for the good of our American farmers.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES. I appreciate the remarks the gentleman is making. Is it not a fact, too, that this appraisal and testimony not only of foreign production of agricultural commodities, but the possibilities of export of American agricultural commodities to foreign countries is an extremely important part of the work done by this office?

Mr. HORAN. Very definitely.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think the gentleman should not give the impression that perhaps kissing and making up is the solution. What we want is a direct relationship between the Department of Agriculture and our foreign embassies and consulates. If the gentleman has the time, I would like to ask him to explain to the committee the delays which have been caused by this roundabout proceeding.

Mr. HORAN. I would like to finish what I started to say, and if it takes more time than I have, Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask for the additional brief time that it will take to explain that.

Here is the difficulty. When our agricultural and other commercial attachés became members of the State Department in many instances their salaries were greater and their retirement pay was greater.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, in many ways they were paid better than the men who served in the Office of Foreign Agriculture Relations when they became members of the State Department. Men who had been Agriculture Department attachés have become counselors and ministers, and I believe in one instance an agricultural attaché is an ambassador. Do you not see the mistakes we made? The only way to correct it is to do what this subcommittee has been doing for many years, to defend and point up the work that is being done by this particular office in the Department of Agriculture, and to insist that, at the Cabinet level, corrections be made.

I think we are going to have to recommend a modification of the Reorganization Act of 1939 so as to make our agricultural attachés and commercial attachés report back direct to their respective Secretaries, the same as our military attachés do today. Until that time comes we have really got to correct this thing. Let us protect, in the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, the group of men who are carrying on as best they can in a very troubled world, the things that need to be done to protect the farmers of America.

There is another point that should be raised. When we have an agricultural attaché he is a member of the State Department, and when we have a reciprocal trade team going to a given point, there to negotiate in a trade on tariffs that might interest us, the captain of that team is always a man high up in the Department of State. It is true that agricultural specialists and attachés do attend those hearings, but where there are two strikes on the batter and there is only one ball left to swing at, it is the man from the State Department who takes the stand and swings that bat for the third time. In other words, by our own actions we have allowed the Department of State to dominate two departments in America that are very important to the farmers of America and American businessmen. I contend that is not what we had in mind when we set up the American Cabinet system.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman is saying that the office of Foreign Agricultural Relations is in a position to supply us with the best information we can get in these foreign countries.

Mr. HORAN. That is correct.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I would like to supplement his statement by saying that Mr. Stanley Andrews has given our committee, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, invaluable information on the situation in Asia.

Mr. HORAN. I understand that. We on the Committee on Agriculture have great respect for Mr. Andrews, and I understand he also is from Arkansas. I hope your committee will look into this thing in the name of equity and justice, and see if there are some modifications that should be made.

Before I close I want to pay my compliments to the House Committee on Agriculture for the report on this whole matter which they put out on March 22, which I think pretty well lays the facts before you and tells you some part of the problems and what ought to be done.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Who hired these men who are serving in these foreign countries?

Mr. HORAN. Some of them came out of the Department of Agriculture in the case of attachés, although I know of one instance where an attaché is in one of the embassies over the protest of the Secretary of Agriculture. You can see that is not good.

Mr. FOGARTY. And you cannot do anything about that?

Mr. HORAN. Not a thing. We cannot do anything about it. They are in the State Department; not in the Department of Agriculture. The office of Foreign Agricultural Relations is the only body we have speaking for the American farmer in foreign lands.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to pay a brief tribute to the Director of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, a very intelligent, sincere, and dynamic administrator, Hon. Stanley Andrews. I know that he is doing an excellent job and is performing in fine fashion the duties of his high poistion. Stanley Andrews is outspoken, frank, and forthright, and I have great confidence in his ability and great faith in his efforts. Until Stanley Andrews became Director of this very important agency of our Government, it was, to use a common expression, "dragging its feet," when all of the officers and employees of the agency should have been alert and wide awake to the great importance of their assignments. In my opinion this agency of the Government was woefully weak and badly handicapped.

Appreciating the importance of intelligent and effective representation in the fields of agriculture in foreign countries and realizing the weaknesses and inadequacies of this agency of Government, the House Committee on Agriculture conducted a study of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations and in the course of this study members of our committee visited many foreign countries and conferred with many of our agricultural attachés and commodity specialists. We also conferred with those representing agriculture in our ECA missions abroad and likewise with the ministers of agriculture in many of the countries of the world. Our committee now has an abundance of information concerning the situations existing in different parts of the world, and we know something about the importance of the agency of the Government which we are now discussing. After conferring with Mr. Andrews and with his associates and after making the studies I have referred to, many substantial changes have been made and we earnestly believe that the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations is now functioning effectively and will continue to improve as Congress provides the necessary money and manpower for the needed expansion of the activities of this agency.

Instead of merely collecting statistics, many of which are of doubtful value, the employees of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations should really and truly represent American agriculture abroad and should make real contributions to the cause of agriculture around the world and, above all, should be directly responsible to the Secretary of Agriculture who, in turn, is directly responsible to Congress. All of our representatives in foreign countries should be impressed with the importance of export markets for the things produced on the American farm. Actually, many of our ambassadors are so carried away with their striped breeches and top hats and with protocol and social events they have little or no time to devote to the problems of agriculture. And many of them frankly are just not interested in anything pertaining to agriculture. Some of them are not even able to discuss the problems of agriculture with any degree of intelligence and display an utter indifference to the problems of the American farmer. Yet, even in the present situation those who are charged with the responsibility of activities pertaining to agriculture are required to report through all of this diplomatic red tape to the State Department rather than to the Department of Agriculture. While the Secretary of Agriculture selects and nominates the persons to be employed by the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations in foreign assignments, all such employees are attached to the State Department payroll and they become swallowed up in diplomatic red tape and some of them actually forget that after all they are just farm boys employed to do a job in a foreign country. The agricultural attachés and commodity specialists are subordinated and submerged in just about every way possible. Many of them never have a chance to discuss their problems and their responsibilities with ambassadors and ministers of agriculture in the countries to which they have been assigned.

Following our study of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations and since Stanley Andrews has taken over as Director, some men have been retired and some have been hired, and all of the employees have been aroused and advised of the importance of their duties. If some of our ambassadors don't wake up to the importance of American agriculture and to the importance of export markets for the products of our farms, and if they do not show some interest in the problems of world agriculture and of the world food supply, some of them ought to be retired or fired. I do not mean to indict our entire diplomatic corps by any means. Some of our ambassadors are intensely interested in the problems of agriculture and understand the importance of American agriculture in world trade and commerce.

Just to give you an idea about how some of our agricultural men abroad are handicapped and hamstrung, I would like to call your attention to a situation which I ran across last fall. I was in the beautiful city of Lisbon and spent many hours with one of our agricultural representatives, making on-the-spot observations on some of the farms of Portugal. This representative was a man of wide experience and great competency. He had only been in Portugal for a short time, but I am convinced that he knew more about Portuguese agriculture than all the ministers of agriculture who had served Portugal in the past quarter of a century. Yet he told me that notwithstanding all that he had learned about Portuguese agriculture and the urgent problems facing the farmers of that country, he could not arrange an audience with those to whom he should tell his story. Of course an agricultural attaché or a commodity specialist cannot dash in to see a foreign minister of agriculture, nor can he at will confer with the Ambassador, but certainly someone, somehow, should be able to arrange such meetings.

I talked with another agricultural attaché who told me that although he had spent 2 or 3 years attached to a certain embassy, he was convinced that the ambassador did not even know who he was and had no idea as to his responsibilities. This man was also one of our very best agricultural representatives, and yet he, too, was hamstrung and submerged in the diplomatic whirlpool.

Our agricultural men abroad have not been accorded the same opportunities for promotion, nor have they been given the same recognition that is accorded the other employees of the State Department; so as a result of this unfortunate situation, a lot of these well-meaning and well-trained agricultural college graduates look for greener pastures and for more lucrative and more attractive assignments. They visualize themselves dressed in striped pants and Homburgs and as consuls or ministers or even perhaps ambassadors; so many of them find other positions.

The Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations should be well financed and well staffed, with competent agricultural specialists, and they should be accorded all the privileges and opportunities which are accorded commercial attachés, political attachés, and other employees of the State Department.

We have been assured that efforts are now being made to improve the situation, which unfortunately has existed. I certainly hope that by appropriate administrative orders and rules and regulations the situation will be improved, and I earnestly hope that no effort will be made to reduce this appropriation for the OFAR, which I honestly consider to be very modest and a very minimum upon which the agency should be required to operate.

Through the OFAR we should be able to obtain very important information and through this agency we should be able to keep in touch with situations abroad. Great demands are being made upon our resources. Many gifts and grants to foreign countries are being authorized by Congress, and through the OFAR the Committees of Congress should be able to obtain accurate information as to the needs of those countries which petition us for either gifts, grants, or loans.

Likewise, the OFAR should be able to furnish us with pertinent information

concerning our export markets for agricultural commodities, and each of the employees of this office in foreign assignments should, above all, be ambassadors of friendship in the countries where they are serving.

I observe that there has been a revival of interest in the activities of the OFAR, and I indulge the hope that this agency will become a vital force in foreign affairs and will function effectively in the welfare of our people.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

For necessary expenses in connection with the publication, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins, documents, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and display of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and exhibits, and the coordination of informational work and programs authorized by Congress in the Department, $1,271,000, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $16,200, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, of which total appropriation amounts not exceeding those specified may be used for the purposes enumerated as follows: For preparation and display of exhibits, $104,725; for preparation, distribution, and display of motion and sound pictures, $75,600; for farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests of the people of the different sections of the country, an equal proportion of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or sent out under the addressed franks furnished by the Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, as they shall direct (7 U. S. C. 417) and not less than 230,850 copies for the use of the Senate and House of Representatives of part 2 of the annual report of the Secretary (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture), as authorized by section 73 of the act of January 12, 1895 (44 U. S. C. 241), $611,128: *Provided*, That additional funds for preparation and display of agricultural motion pictures and exhibits relating to the programs of the various agencies of the Department authorized by Congress, not exceeding $150,000, may be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, from the funds applicable, and shall be available for the objects specified herein: *Provided further*, That in the preparation of motion pictures or exhibits by the Department, not exceeding a total of $10,000 may be used for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the establishment or maintenance of regional or State field offices, or for the compensation of employees in such offices.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language in lines 4 to 9, inclusive, page 46, on the ground that it involves additional duties on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: On page 46, line 4, in lieu of the matter stricken insert "together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses, which several amounts not exceeding a total of $16,200, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the language as now offered by the gentleman from Mississippi strikes out the words "as may be determined by the Secretary." The action of transferring these additional appropriations from another fund still requires, whether those words are there or not, independent action on the part of the Secretary, therefore, it does involve additional duties on his part and is still subject to the same point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, this language has been held to be in order many times. Under the general transfer provisions of the bill the Department of Agriculture may transfer to the extent of 7 percent. This is a limitation on the amount he may transfer, because in the absence of this limitation the 7-percent provision would apply.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from Mississippi, may I say that frequently we see this language in an appropriation bill. But no point of order is made against it. When a point of order is made against such language, I believe it should be stricken because it does involve additional duties on the part of the Secretary; otherwise, there is no method of knowing how much of this amount will be transferred. It does not authorize the appropriation or transfer of a specific sum of money.

The CHAIRMAN. Is this a new appropriation?

Mr. WHITTEN. It is not new at all. Without this language they could transfer a certain amount of money. With this language there is an intimation given as to how much money may be transferred. The Department has a general provision making it possible to transfer up to 7 percent. So there being no new money here and this being a limitation or reducing the amount below that which could otherwise be transferred, I respectfully insist it is not subject to a point of order. I might also point out that this is expressly authorized under 601 of the Economy Act, 31 United States Code, 686.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair feels this is a transfer within the Department of Agriculture authorized by law. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out in discussing the point of order, this is a limitation on the amount of transfer insofar as the intent of the committee is concerned. While this sounds like an authorization for transferring money, to those who do not like any transfer at all it is better to have some limitation instead of none.

I respectfully submit that the amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury by canceling notes issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury in the amount of $76,808,000 for the net costs during the fiscal year 1950 under the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C. 1641–1642).

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph on page 50, lines 5 to 12, inclusive, International Wheat Agreement, on the ground that that is a new authorization and a direction to the Secretary of the Treasury to handle this item contrary to the manner in which it has been handled, and therefore constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the fiscal year 1952 for such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided.

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

Commodity Credit Corporation: Nothing in this act shall be so construed as to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from carrying out any activity or any program authorized by law: *Provided*, That not to exceed $15,000,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corporation: *Provided further*, That all necessary expenses (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest, including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury by canceling notes issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury in the amount of the capital impairment determined by the appraisal of June 30, 1950 (but not to exceed $427,000,000), pursuant to sections 1 and 4 of the act of March 8, 1938, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a–1, 4).

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HESELTON: Page 51, line 21, strike out the period and insert "*Provided further*, That $1,000,000 of this appropriation shall be placed in reserve, to be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, only in such amounts and at such times as may become necessary due to the existence of substantial surpluses of the basic commodities requiring mandatory price controls."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I understand the gentleman from Mississippi is in agreement with this amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to say that this appropriation for the Commodity Credit Corporation in effect is a limitation on the administrative funds that can be used. I am well aware of the efforts on the part of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] to try to hold down these administrative costs, and I concur in those efforts. However, realizing the great demands being made on American agriculture to produce, and knowing that the only thing that stands between them and absolute ruin under some conditions is the Commodity Credit Corporation, that we have a hesitancy to hold the limitation as low as we might otherwise. It strikes me that the approach the gentleman makes is utterly sound, and we join with him. I just want to say that we are all driving in the same direction, that the approach is sound, and we accept the amendment.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the action taken by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], as well as that of the entire subcommittee. I am certain that this is a move in the right direction.

So that the background of the amendment may be fully explained and available to the Commodity Credit Corporation, I want to outline briefly the facts which led me to submit it. It would set aside $1,000,000 from the $15,000,000 recommended by the subcommittee for administrative expenses in a reserve fund and no expenditures could be made from that $1,000,000 unless and until the existence of substantial surpluses of the basic commodities developed to justify any use of any part of this $1,000,000.

The budget estimate was for $20,200,000.

Any study of the hearings presents convincing evidence of the wisdom of the subcommittee's decision to recommend a reduction of $5,200,000. It may be thought that this reduction is substantial. Of course, it is, but there is clear and sufficient evidence to convince anyone that we are amply warranted in making this further restriction.

It is clear from the hearings that no satisfactory effort was made by this Agency to relate its requests for funds to its requirements or to existing conditions. It just used the same figure it used when it submitted its supplemental request to Congress on November 29, 1950, of $3,850,000, bringing the total request in fiscal 1951 to $20,200,000. The subcommittee was amply warranted in reporting that "this"—its—"reduction is believed justified in view of the current outlook for agriculture and the probable change from surpluses to shortages in many of the commodities normally handled by the Corporation."

It is equally clear that the request submitted last fall and presented to the subcommittee on February 12 has no relation to the Agency's activities now, or in prospect for fiscal 1952.

Its latest report is for the month ending March 31. I placed in the RECORD last Wednesday the results of a study of its commodity inventories on March 31 compared to June 30, 1950.

In butter, cheese, dried milk, and dried eggs alone there was a reduction of 505,699,732 pounds, from 677,401,610 pounds to 171,701,878 pounds.

Extending this to 16 commodities, the reduction is from 6,561,211,062 pounds to 2,604,691,295 pounds, or a decrease of 60.3 percent.

The same sharp downward trend in holdings is evident in most of the other commodities. Let me give you seven examples:

	June 30, 1950	Mar. 31, 1951
Cotton ..... bales	3,413,635	86,813
Cottonseed ..... tons	211,178	2,941
Flaxseed ..... bushels	13,373,583	5,117,761
Turpentine ..... gallons	2,586,765	500,000
Oats ..... bushels	12,108,620	9,997,233
Rye ..... do	514,624	364,274
Soybeans ..... do	53,017	1,093

An examination of the estimate shows that about 75 percent is for personal services, $15,042,000 of the $20,200,000.

It is significant that this Agency's estimate shows a request for 814 more employees than in fiscal 1951, from 3,721 to 4,535.

It is of greater significance that its representative offered as one justification for its request that 2 or 3 weeks before its last appearance before the subcommittee on February 20, it had asked to be declared, and had been declared, a Defense Agency. This resulted in a very proper and pertinent examination by the subcommittee. Let me quote:

Mr. HORAN. Do not forget this: That a man who is in a defense agency, whether he is doing good work or not—and we all have to admit the possibility that he might be loafing—under certain circumstances, especially unless you and this committee can justify his existence as a Government employee, as a member working for a defense agency, he has at least one additional bargaining argument with the draft board whereas some of our 18-year-olds out on the farms who are actually producing what the PMA is interested in may not have an equal argument with the draft board in his county. That can happen. That can happen unless we take a very realistic look at this defense agency picture.

The subcommittee requested a statement of estimated price support volume for fiscal 1952. There is a notation that it was an estimate as of February 1.

A study of that against the March 31 report points up conclusively the unrealistic approach taken by this Agency toward its requirements.

Let me take just three commodities:

	Estimated inventory	Actual inventory
	Pounds	*Pounds*
Butter	26,049,213	9,555,226
Cheese	10,992,053	7,145
Dried milk	222,931,819	94,170,819
Total	260,483,085	104,133,190

That is 156,349,895 pounds below the estimates for fiscal 1952, more than a 60-percent difference. I have tried to obtain more current information but have found no one who will give me facts as to the inventory situation today. But there is an item on the ticker in the Speaker's lobby stating that the Department of Agriculture has announced it is buying no more butter.

There is a very important statement by Mr. Trigg at page 119 of the hearings. After stating that they had $1,613,000,000 worth of commodities in inventory then, the chairman of the subcommittee said, "You have that now, but what is it going to be by the 1st of July?" Mr. Trigg replied, "We will have some new crops at that time; our budget estimate is that we will have inventories valued at $1,900,000,000 on July 1, 1951."

Standing alone this means nothing. Here is the CCC report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950. On July 1, 1950, they had on hand inventories valued at $2,643,153,372.70. So their own budget estimate anticipates about $750,000,000 less to begin this coming fiscal year. And I submit I have proven how much in error their fall and winter estimates were.

Beyond this, does anybody think that this agency is going to embark on a program of buying up huge quantities of wholesome foods in the foreseeable future, with prospective shortages and skyrocketing prices. If there is any danger of this, it is one more good reason for making certain that it can do no such thing by not authorizing too much money.

The hearings also include a table—table 6 at page 68 of the hearings—showing the corporate administration expense limitations from 1938 to 1950, inclusive, in connection with the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, the Production Credit Corporation and the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. The Commodity Credit Corporation started at $500,000 in 1938 and progressively increased each year, with two exceptions, until it reached $20,200,000 in this fiscal year. That is 394 percent increase. The other four have either progressively decreased or have increased only moderately.

I have prepared the following table from the summary and from recent re-

ports of the Commodity Credit Corporation. It is in millions of dollars:

1938	0.5
1939	.7
1940	2.0
1941	2.3
1942	3.5
1943	4.4
1944	5.4
1945	7.2
1946	8.9
1947	8.8
1949	8.1
1950	15.4
1951	20.2
Estimated, 1952	20.2

The subcommittee provided probably the most convincing argument for a further reduction in its report filed on April 4, 1949, and I want to quote the pertinent language:

The budget estimate for this purpose is in the sum of $12,000,000 which the committee has approved. The amount provided in the regular act for 1949 was $7,575,000. In the first deficiency bill now pending in the Senate, this 1949 amount is increased to $10,814,700. The necessity for this increase is occasioned by the excessively large 1948 crop resulting in a drop in prices of a number of the major commodities below the level established by law, requiring substantial increases in the number of loans and other price support activities. The increase provided in the deficiency bill referred to will cover the increased activities of the corporation in this field for the remainder of the current fiscal year.

Here, then, we have a clear contrast in the very substantially increased activities justifying an appropriation in the sum of $12,000,000 for fiscal 1950 in comparison to the admitted sharp decrease in activities now and in prospect for fiscal 1952.

I also placed in the Appendix of the RECORD on May 10 at page A2817 excerpts from questions and statements of members of the committee, particularly those of the able chairman of this subcommittee. I want to repeat a few of these:

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, let us just get down to brass tacks. I think you will admit, under the present outlook, that you will not have one-half the volume of commodities for the Commodity Credit Corporation next year that you have had this year, will you not? (p. 118).

* * * * *

Mr. WHITTEN. But, as I was pointing out, you will not be handling as big a volume of commodities for one thing.

Mr. TRIGG. Of course, we will not. * * *

Mr. WHITTEN. We should set these figures of administrative expense knowing today that there is every probability that you will handle less volume. If the situation gets out of hand later, you could then come back and ask for more employees for the CCC (p. 119).

* * * * *

Mr. WHITTEN. Again, I am not suggesting a major reduction in expenses. I am just discussing the difference between $17,000,000 and $20,000,000 or $15,000,000 for that purpose. I think your figures can stand a lot of study for the next fiscal year (p. 119).

Mr. HORAN. I just want to point out that we have revised our thinking, too, up here in Congress, and the Korean War and the defense effort has caused that. The average cost has gone up, and I think that you as taxpayers are looking to us to do what we can to hold down costs wherever we can, to see that any of these items are justified in reality, and I am disturbed about the size and the shape of this particular item. I do not want to do anything to hurt the Commodity Credit Corporation. I realize what it means, but along with the chairman and the rest of this subcommittee, we need your cooperation on this. We want to do what we are supposed to do, but frankly I am still at a loss as to why this item should be increased (p. 132).

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. HORAN, I think you have proven our case. The testimony up to this point is that last May and June the Commodity Credit Corporation made a survey and arrived at how much manpower it would take to handle a given volume on a per unit basis. Then they multiplied that by the volume, and they came up with this $20,200,000, which includes the $3,850,000 they are asking for now. They cannot sustain that, because they will not have that volume.

Mr. BEACH. It appears that way.

Mr. WHITTEN. You just said it was that. You said last May and June you worked up the unit cost, coming up with $20,000,000. Now you come up with the same number of dollars, so you are bound to have used the same volume. You may have some difference from one program to another, but you are using approximately the same volume in total. You cannot justify it (pp. 132–133).

Mr. WHITTEN. Now, the Commodity Credit Corporation's activities—you cannot have anything like the volume of work through the Commodity Credit Corporation next year that you had this year (p. 534).

Finally, I recognize that it could be argued that this is only a limitation and that the Agency must be expected to hold down its expenditures as far as possible. If it was a question of an operation which was either breaking even or making a profit, that might be a legitimate argument. However, from its own report, from October 17, 1933, through March 31, 1951, it shows a total loss of $2,671,384,309.

It pays the costs of administrative expenses from its capital funds, but in the final analysis that money is raised from only one source—taxation. I am certain that we are on sound ground in taking this action this afternoon. An unrestricted authorization to use the full $15,000,000 would be definitely an invitation to excessive and unnecessary expenditures. This action constitutes a clear mandate and warning that every effort should be made to manage this Corporation in the light of existing conditions and with some real consideration of the burden which is going to be placed upon the American people in terms of additional taxation.

I have every confidence that this subcommittee will examine with great care any use of this $1,000,000. I hope and believe that it will not be necessary to use any part of it. This action should bring about a definite saving to the American taxpayers.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 404. No part of the funds appropriated by this act shall be used for the payment of any officer or employee of the Department who, as such officer or employee, or on behalf of the Department or any division, commission, or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued, any prediction, oral or written, or forecast, except as to damage threatened or caused by insects and pests, with respect to future prices of cotton or the trend of same.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: Page 55, line 2, strike out the word "cotton" and insert "any farm commodity."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I will not seek recognition if the committee feels inclined to accept the amendment. I have discussed it with some members of the committee who think it is wise to extend this prohibition to any farm commodity.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I want to say that it is entirely possible that the gentleman is correct, but this whole issue has been batted around whether it is wise or unwise in regard to cotton. I certainly would not want to agree that it applied to others for I cannot speak for so many other commodities. It is a controversial question, and I certainly would not want to do it without adequate hearings.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the position of the gentleman from Mississippi, that he could not accept this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of section 404 is very obvious, and it is a commendable purpose, to provide that none of the funds shall be used for the payment of compensation to any officer or employee of this Department who causes a leak, let us say, as to the future prices of cotton or the trend in the price of cotton. Those on the inside in the Department of Agriculture do have confidential information about various farm commodities. It is very proper that the committee should provide that no part of these funds should be used to pay an employee who did give away some of this inside information. It seems to me that applies equally to any other farm commodity, and that anyone in the Department of Agriculture who gives inside information as to any farm commodity, in order that he or his friends or others may thereby profit, should be deprived of his compensation in just the same way that applies to cotton.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Personally, Mr. Chairman, I cannot see any objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING]. It simply says that, along with cotton, if anybody in the Department of Agriculture for purposes of his own allows things to get out which might violate the secrecy which we hold upon the release of crop reports, he then is subject to discharge, or at least no funds in this measure will be allowed for his salary. I certainly agree with the gentleman from New York that this will not in any way harm the bill.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. I am somewhat concerned, since the gentleman's amendment is very far reaching. I am thinking particularly of the livestock industry, where we have a Federal Marketing Service which does predict the market conditions in the future, and which has been of very much protection to the farmers of the Midwest. Will the gentleman tell me what his amendment would do to the prediction of the market as far as livestock is concerned?

Mr. KEATING. My feeling is that that is a public service, and that nothing in this amendment would prevent the Secretary of Agriculture in an official way from doing anything he is doing today. This whole section is directed against those who act under the table or behind the curtain. I have no pride of authorship in the precise language "any farm commodity." It certainly is not my intention to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from issuing proper market reports. Nor do I believe this amendment would have that effect. If the gentleman has any better language to effectuate the purpose and if he is in sympathy with my objective, I would be glad to have him substitute such language as he thinks would be preferable.

Mr. MARSHALL. I can say to the gentleman that I am in sympathy with what he is attempting to do, but to attempt to write legislation here on the floor of the House today that would cover all of these items, and I am thinking particularly about the livestock industry, would be beyond my scope, without going into hearings. When you say "prediction" as outlined in this paragraph, may I say that weather conditions affect markets, so the market might be dependent upon weather conditions. There are a number of conditions involved.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, within the cotton industry there has been quite a controversy as to whether or not this provision should be in the bill with regard to cotton, but it has been in there for a number of years and, they having become reconciled to it more or less, the committee has gone along with it. But we checked with the Department, and the information they gave us is that if you do this as to all commodities you do away with the crop and livestock estimates.

The section which the gentleman seeks to broaden provides:

> No part of the funds appropriated by this act shall be used for the payment of any officer or employee of the Department who, as such officer—

And that includes the Secretary of Agriculture—

> or employee, or on behalf of the Department or any division, commission, or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued, any prediction, oral or written, or forecast, except as to damage threatened or caused by insects and pests, with respect to future prices of cotton or the trend of same.

It is true that the futures market on cotton has been more sensitive than any other market. If you adopt this amendment you will be destroying your marketing news service and you will be fixing it where there can be no estimate with regard to wheat and with regard to the supply of hogs and with regard to what is going to move on the market and with regard to many things that make for orderly operation at this time of all times when there is a shortage of food supplies. Now that is what I am afraid of, and there is much to indicate it, and the Department says that that is true. Now, if we had hearings on this and you may say that you might come up with a different answer, but certainly the Department, having taken their position and seeing the dangers in it now, I think you would make a serious mistake to adopt this amendment without any more explanation, other than that which the gentleman from New York intimates that he just wants others to be treated as cotton is treated. I do not want any special treatment. But some folks believe it is not good in cotton and they point out it would not work at all with regard to these other commodities. This amendment is too far reaching to be adopted without knowing what we are doing. I think this amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEATING) there were—ayes 36, noes 81.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 407. No part of the funds made available by this act may be used to compensate any person for employment in the Federal service outside the continental limits of the United States at a rate higher than is paid for comparable work in the Federal service within the continental limits of the United States, other than a person who was a resident citizen of the continental United States at the date of his appointment to a position outside the continental limits of the United States and has had continuous employment in the Federal service (except as interrupted by service in the Armed Forces of the United States) from the date of such appointment.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. BARTLETT: On page 55, line 19, strike out on pages 55 and 56 all of section 407.

(Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to strike out all of section 407. That section is identical with the language which heretofore appeared in the Department of the Interior appropriation bill. An amendment was offered at that time and was agreed to. Section 407 would in effect establish two pay standards for identical jobs. At this time a cost-of-living allowance is paid, under authority of Congress, to Federal employees in the Territories and possessions. In Alaska that amounts to 25 percent. In Hawaii it amounts to 20 percent, and I believe, although I am not absolutely sure, that it amounts to 25 percent in Puerto Rico. If this section is adopted, a person hired in Alaska, for example, will not receive the allowance, but the person hired in the States will get 25 percent more than the Alaskan for doing the same job. That is basically wrong.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The Interior Department Subcommittee on Appropriations did include this same provision in the bill. After that the committee made a more thorough study of it and we discovered what we thought was a bad mistake.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am happy to hear the gentleman say that.

Mr. JENSEN. So the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and myself, the ranking member, and in fact the entire subcommittee, were agreeable to having that section stricken out of the Interior Department appropriation bill. It is identical, word for word, with the wording in this bill which the gentleman is asking to be stricken.

Mr. BARTLETT. We are grateful to the gentleman and his colleagues for doing that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If my memory serves me correctly, the cost of living in Alaska is considerably higher than it is in the United States.

Mr. BARTLETT. Precisely.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The pay scale, generally speaking, is based on the same pay scale as in effect in this country, with the proviso that those who are hired in the continental United States to go to Alaska shall receive a 25-percent differential over those who work in the Territory. I think the same also applies to the Territory of Hawaii, where we all know the cost of living is extremely high. I sincerely hope each of you, the Delegate from Hawaii, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, who are behind this amendment and have explained it so fully to this House, will receive the support of the committee and that the amendment will be passed, just because simple justice must be done to the inhabitants of those areas.

Mr. BARTLETT. I appreciate that. It does cost more to live in Alaska. Some figures were released 2 weeks ago disclosing that it costs 47 percent more to live in Fairbanks than in Seattle, and 40 percent more in Anchorage. So the allowance does not even cover the increased cost of living.

The hearings disclosed only a reference in a comparatively few words to the situation in Puerto Rico. No mention was made of Alaska or Hawaii. I do not know what the situation is in Puerto Rico. It has been suggested that this should be looked into. We welcome that. If an investigation is held and the committee considers this, it will give us an opportunity to present testi-

mony and to make our case. We have a strong case. We can demonstrate adequately that a cost-of-living allowance is justified.

I think that the committee a week ago yesterday laid the ground work for accepting this amendment, because the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] then said:

I hope that out of the debate today and tomorrow we will have found many reasons for further consideration of constructive, honest legislation which will modify the existing legislation along that line.

The chairman of the committee [Mr. WHITTEN] said:

We contemplate bringing in a bill of general application. Doubtless this provision will have consideration when we come to writing the bill on general application. Certainly they should be treated alike, across the board.

That is all right. Give us a chance to be heard. Give us a chance to have expert witnesses called in. This allowance now is being paid under authority conferred in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1948, as amended. Subsequently Executive Order No. 10000 was issued. Safeguards were set up. I urge the committee to accept this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the Delegate from Alaska has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I agree in the sentiments expressed by the Delegate from Alaska.

In the Territory of Hawaii there are today close to 25,000 civilians in the employ of the Federal Government. The adoption of this section as proposed by the committee would reduce by 20 percent the compensation of only 100 to 150 of that great army of Federal employees. I think it is grossly unfair to the employees of the Department of Agriculture that they should be singled out for this treatment.

The proposal is not only unjust but it is unsound. We know from experience that you cannot operate efficiently and effectively a group of employees in any field of work with part of them receiving 20 percent more compensation than the rest.

At the present time the Federal Government maintains a program for the eradication of the oriental fruitfly. That insect was introduced during the period of the war. Its elimination from Hawaii is important for the protection particularly of the citrus industry of the west coast. There are in the employ of the Department of Agriculture in that project 63 persons; 51 of them are residents of Hawaii; 12 are resident of the States with voting representation in Congress.

What you do by this proposal is to say to those 51 employees who live in Hawaii and maintain their residence there that they are going to have their compensation cut by 20 percent. This is colonialism of the worst sort; it is vicious, nothing less.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I understood the gentleman favored the amendment offered by the Delegate from Alaska.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I favor it, and I hope the committee will support it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentlemen is condemning the provision of the bill which would be amended by the gentleman from Alaska, the one the gentleman from Alaska seeks to strike from the bill.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I thank the gentleman for clarifying my position. I approve the amendment offered by the Delegate from Alaska. I am merely trying to explain to the committee what will happen if Mr. BARTLETT's amendment is not adopted and this provision eliminated from the bill. I do not want to prolong the debate any further, because we reviewed this issue very completely during the course of general debate. I do think that this is no time and this is no way to handle this particular problem and most certainly hope that the amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recognized to close the debate.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, certainly it is not my desire to hurt anyone. This happens to be the bill that comes before our subcommittee, and insofar as the present is concerned, we are limited to what we can do in connection with the Department of Agriculture. I have been designated to prepare some language of a general nature to be offered at a later date which will be generally applicable throughout the Government.

I know there have been some complaints as a result of pay differentials under present law, and this is what we are trying to stop. Under present law, we pay a native Puerto Rican, a native Alaskan, or a native Hawaiian, a man who has lived there all his life, who has his home there, and to whom that is home, 25 percent more than we pay within the continental United States to people to do the same kind of work. It just does not seem right to me. I want to give people in Territories every chance for fair treatment. I hear from time to time that they do not think they are a part of the United States because of lack of statehood, and we all have our ideas about that. Why should you pay a native of Puerto Rico, who was born there and has his home there, 25 percent more to work in the post office in Puerto Rico than you pay a man to work in the post office in San Francisco, Kalamazoo, or New York? Why should you require the Department under the law to pay them this extra amount? Of course, they have been getting it and they disapprove our stopping that practice. If we are going to follow that practice, why should we not pay a man more to work in New York or in Boston or in the city of Washington? Are we going to pay men 25 percent more to work in New York, 15 percent more to work in Boston and 33 percent more to work in Washington? After all, we are all Americans.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman is aware of the fact that under the independent offices appropriation bill the Government does not have to pay that 25 percent; it can pay a lesser amount.

Mr. WHITTEN. Insofar as I know it is 25 percent except in Hawaii where it is 20 percent. I believe in fair treatment, but special treatment is another matter.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Something has been said about the differential in pay so far as the State Department is concerned. We do have differentials in pay in that Department in cases where Americans work at hardship posts, but we do not pay the natives of those countries a larger amount of money than we do the Americans.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to what the gentleman from Nebraska has said, he is making a comparison between the Americans and natives of a country. Here we are making a comparison between United States citizens and citizens of territories.

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes. This does not have the same effect as where a man goes to some place to work where there is a differential based on hardships. Under this system you would pay certain Americans 25 percent more at their place of residence than you would pay other Americans in continental United States for work at their homes. I think we are sound here. I am sorry that is in this one bill, but I give you my assurance it will be covered in a bill of general application which we hope to report later.

I think the amendment should be defeated. We want to treat everybody alike. We cannot justify a differential between Americans, each of them at home, and start a system where the folks in New York get one salary, the folks in Biloxi, Miss., another salary and in San Francisco another. Under this system that is what you have and we are trying to correct it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BARTLETT) there were—ayes 32, noes 100.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 409. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an

organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided,* That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further,* That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further,* That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further,* That nothing in this section shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person employed for less than 60 days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property, the payment of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by this section.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Page 58, after line 4, insert "No part of any appropriation contained in this act or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Paul Leach, writing in the Detroit Free Press on February 18, 1951, said that the American people are supporting more than 45,000 Federal employees who are engaged directly or indirectly, full or part-time is dispensing information, publicity, and propaganda. This information was supplied by the Budget Bureau more than 2 years ago and since that time the tendency has been to extend these services. Many of the 45,000 are said to be carried on payrolls in capacities other than publicity. They are used part time to further administration or departmental ideas and aims and to stir up protest groups to influence legislation. He also reported that of this 45,000, 8,000 stenographers and information officers are engaged directly in public-relations work. The annual pay runs from $3,000 to $10,300, with a few section chiefs getting $15,000. Six thousand of these employees, the largest group, is on the payroll of the State Department and the Economic Cooperation Administration.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] just a year ago called attention to the fact that the annual cost of Government printing alone, that is not including original research, writing type, editing, reviewing, and checking is over $50,000. One Government agency admits that editing and preparing copy for the printers costs three times as much as the annual printing. On that basis the cost of Government publicity would run about $200,000,000 annually, but this does not include the cost of research and writing.

I feel sure that the Members of this House do not realize the extent of widespread overlapping in federally owned printing plants and facilities, not only among departments, but in cities throughout the country. Did you know that there are 61 separate Government printing and duplicating plants in Washington; that there are 23 in San Francisco; 25 in Philadelphia; 16 in Chicago; 6 in Kansas City; 6 in Denver; 16 in New York, and many others? The Army and Air Force alone have 140 printing and duplicating plants, the Navy has 87, the Department of Commerce has 26, and the Interior Department has 15.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] also reported that tons and tons of undistributed Government publications are sold as waste paper each year to clear storage space for new publications. In 1947 and 1948 the Government Printing Office condemned more than 10,000,000 copies of publications. Investigators for the Senate Appropriations Committee found as many as 500,000 copies of some publications on hand and 200,000 to 300,000 copies of others.

(Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Smith amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have supported this amendment on all bills to which it has been presented, but I think it is particularly appropriate to the Department of Agriculture. I think the Members of this body have not yet forgotten the disgraceful experience of a year ago when the PMA committeemen were called into Minneapolis at the taxpayers expense to form a captive audience to let the Secretary of Agriculture expound his own personal strait jacket political farm plan and hoped that those people would go to their respective home communities as disciples for that kind of a regimentation plan. Taking their cue from the Secretary himself, top flight officials in the Department of Agriculture are continuing their attempt to use that tax supported agency as a base of operations for the Democratic National Committee. On Tuesday of this week I personally witnessed another episode in that campaign to wed the agencies of the Government to the Democratic National Committee. The occasion was the award ceremony down at the Washington Monument which was held on Tuesday morning. Several Members of Congress, whose constituents were the recipients of awards there, were invited to attend. Dr. Walter Ebling, of the Department of Agriculture, at Madison, Wis., was one of those recipients, and at his suggestion I was happy to go down to the Monument for the ceremonies there. I think the idea of the ceremonies is fine, but I think the Members of Congress from both parties who attended were considerably taken aback when Assistant Secretary Hutchinson, after introducing some of the top executives of the Department and the Members of Congress and their wives who were in attendance, then introduced a certain Mr. Moore, assistant to the chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Except for those top-flight Agricultural Department employees and except for the Members of Congress, he was the only person there who was so honored as a dignatary. I do not know what his purpose was in introducing that one particular individual, unless it was to make the employees in the Department, who had been released from their regular employment in order to attend that ceremony, believe that, so far as the top-flight officials of the Department were concerned, the executives of the Department of Agriculture and the assistant to the Democratic National Committee were to be on the same plane in their eyes.

I have enough confidence in the people who came there to witness that ceremony to believe that they are not going to be sucked in on that kind of an effort, that they are going to resent that kind of effort. At the same time I think it reflects and is an illustration of this insidious attempt on the part of certain executives in the Department of Agriculture to use propaganda for their own purposes, paid for at the taxpayers' expense. I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin is indeed appropriate for this Department.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 6 minutes, the last minute to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, on each of the appropriation bills this amendment has been presented. I have supported it. The amendment has carried consistently. However, during the debate on the Federal Security Administration-Labor Department appropriation bill the question was raised whether or not the Appropriations Subcommittees were staffed sufficiently to study the matter of Government propaganda and publicity with a view to determining which publications were legitimate statistical reports of the Government, which were propaganda designed to influence public opinion, and which were worthless publications costing the taxpayers a lot of money without any benefit to them and were of little or no public interest.

On that occasion the chairman of the subcommittee said that if the Members of the House would present to him evidence of wasteful and useless propaganda he would get a staff and go into the matter. It occurred to me that we have a committee, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which is already equipped with the subpena power and the jurisdiction to investigate wasteful expenditures of public funds on publications. Accordingly, on May 14, I addressed a letter to the gentleman from Virginia, the Honorable PORTER HARDY, chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Operations of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and in that two-page letter I requested that his subcommittee look into this matter of expenditures on Government publications and propaganda.

I recommended that we find out: First, the cost to the taxpayers of the paper, the printing, the research and study, the distribution, including an estimate of the cost of franked mail, the cost of storage of the printed material, and general overhead for administrative costs. Second, whether the publication was required by law or whether it was the voluntary activity of a particular agency. Third, an appraisal of the public interest in specific publications. Fourth, a consideration of whether or not the information presently provided by Federal publications could be provided by private sources.

I find that this matter of Government publications has been one of considerable interest over a long period of time. The Senate Appropriations Committee in 1942 made a study of this subject and issued a report. In 1948 the Senate Appropriations Committee again considered the matter of Government propaganda. That committee requested examples of publications from the several agencies of the Government. In pursuance to this request they received about 84,000 different publications, which filled a whole room here in the Capitol Building. Here are a few examples of what we are paying for. Here is one on How To Control Vagrant Cats. Here is another one on Mist Netting for Birds in Japan. Here is another one, Fish for Breakfast, and Why Not? Here is another one on Japanese Ornithology and Mammalogy During World War II. That is the type of thing we are putting out and I think, although there may be some public interest in these publications, someone ought to find out what that public interest is. Someone ought to start calling a halt to theorists drafting studies with little or no public interest at the public expense and consuming thousands and thousands of square feet of storage space, vitally needed in Washington, for old, obsolete publications no longer of any interest to anyone.

I hope the committee will go diligently into the subject and unlike previous investigations of this matter will come up with some concrete recommendations which will start cutting down these Government publications. It is particularly timely in view of the newsprint shortage we have at this time and the great expenditures we must make for our mobilization effort.

I hope the Committee will support this amendment and that in all future appropriation bills similar amendments will be included and that the House will support the Hardy committee, or any other committee that shows any interest in going into this subject. By getting at the facts and the detailed justification in each instance is the only way we can separate worth-while publications from those that are useless, wasteful, and extravagant.

My letter to the gentleman from Virginia, Congressman HARDY, and his reply to me are as follows:

MAY 14, 1951.

Hon. PORTER HARDY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Government Operations, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARDY: During the debate on the various appropriation bills the question has arisen regarding the propaganda and publicity activities of the Federal Government. As you are aware in those appropriation bills which have been passed by the House, an amendment has been adopted which prohibits the use of funds appropriated for publicity and propaganda purposes, except those previously authorized by the Congress.

As you are also aware, many publications are available to Congressmen for distribution to their constituents at no charge.

I believe there is a general consensus of opinion among the Members of the Congress that the executive branch of the Government ought not to engage in activities designed to influence public opinion toward some particular national program. I think it would also be the general censensus of opinion of the Members of Congress that there are certain statistical reports and certain scientific and research activities engaged in by the Federal Government which could not very well be duplicated by any nonpublic institution.

It seems to me that the basic question is one of distinguishing between publications which it is right and proper for the agencies of the Federal Government to issue as matters of public interest on the one hand, and those which are either designed to influence public opinion or which are obsolete, wasteful, and of little or no public interest on the other hand.

It is apparent from the outset that any study of Federal publications, designed to separate those which are useful and proper as an expenditure of public funds and those which are wasteful and unnecessary, would require a great many man-hours of careful study on the part of competent and disinterested investigators.

For this reason, I discussed the matter informally with you this morning to ascertain whether or not your subcommittee which, in my opinion, has clear jurisdiction to undertake such an investigation, is adequately staffed to assume this task, and whether or not—assuming the House of Representatives supported you with sufficient funds—you thought it would be a desirable investigation for your subcommittee to pursue. It had been my intention, in case you had indicated that your subcommittee was not interested in pursuing this subject, to suggest some alternate method of exploring this particular activity of the executive branch of the Government.

I was very much gratified to find that you believed this matter was one which ought to be examined by your subcommittee.

It seems to me that there are various aspects of this problem to which attention should be devoted. Undoubtedly, additional questions will arise as any such investigation proceeds.

1. What is the annual cost to the United States taxpayers of the current volume of Federal publications, including: (a) paper and printing; (b) research and study; (c) distribution, including an estimate of the cost of franked mail; (d) storage of printed material; (d) general overhead for administrative costs.

2. Whether publication is required by law, or whether it is the voluntary activity of a particular Federal agency.

3. An appraisal of the public interest in specific publications.

4. Consideration of whether or not the information presently provided by Federal publications could be provided by private sources.

I fully appreciate that this study is of such magnitude that a great deal could not be accomplished within a short period of time. However, it would seem to me that the committee might well concentrate on those publications which appear to have little or no public interest, and which seem to involve a substantial amount of public expenditure, with a view to the early elimination of wasteful and extravagant publications. In this way the work of the committee could begin to bear fruit progressively as it engaged in its undertaking.

I assure you that I shall be only too happy to support any requests for appropriations for a larger staff for your subcommittee in case your committee desires to engage in this investigation.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 16, 1951.

Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: Thanks for yours of May 14 discussing in greater detail the suggestion that the subcommittee concern itself with a study of the voluminous publications of the Federal Government.

As I told you in our discussion of this subject, I do consider this an extremely worthwhile suggestion. In fact, as a part of this total picture I have addressed a communication to the Department of Labor relating to certain of its publications. It may be that through correspondence some preliminary data can be secured pending the development of certain activities in which the committee and the staff are now engaged. I think it unwise to undertake any new activity of a scope which you envisioned until after some of our current studies have progressed further.

Additionally, you are somewhat familiar with my current efforts to improve the committee staff organization. Therefore, I wish you would remind me of this suggestion so that we may give further consideration to its initiation as soon as circumstances permit.

Sincerely,

PORTER HARDY, Jr., *Chairman.*

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the bill already restricts the expenditure of funds for information to work authorized by Congress. It further provides for the transfer of funds to the Office of Information for preparation of exhibits and motion pictures relating to the programs of the various agencies of the Department authorized by Congress. There is no authority now and there is no money now appropriated under the law for the uses such as the gentleman's amendment would prohibit. If it helps the matter any more to prohibit that which they

have no authority to do, I might say if you want to include that language it is all right. There has always been a difference of opinion as to whether in any particular case, in discussing the past as against the future, whether it is propaganda or good, sound argument. That difference of opinion will always exist. But if you want to make it a little stronger by prohibiting that which they have no authority to do, I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 58, after line 4 insert a new section as follows:

"No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within the agency;

"(c) to offices or position required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to seasonal and casual workers;

"(e) to meat inspectors;

"(f) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2;

"(g) to field employees of the Soil Conservation Service and Production Marketing Administration who provide conservation assistance to farmers and ranchers.

"*Provided further*, That when any department or agency covered in this act has reduced their employment rolls to 80 percent of the total number on their rolls as of July 1, 1951, this limitation may cease to apply."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment be limited to 10 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a similar amendment to the amendment that was adopted by the House on the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill, the Interior Department appropriation bill, and the independent offices appropriation bill. However, there is some difference, which I will explain.

As I said before, each amendment must be tailored to fit the particular agency to which it will apply. This amendment exempts seasonal and casual workers in the Department of Agriculture. The Soil Conservation Service employ during their busiest seasons in the spring and fall, part-time workers who only stay on the job so long as there is work to do. This exemption also exempts fire-fighting temporary employees in the Forest Service, and so forth.

The next exemption eliminates meat inspectors. Meat inspection is necessary for the protection of everybody's health.

The next exemption is the field employees of the Soil Conservation Service, and the Production and Marketing Administration, which provide conservation assistance to the farmers and ranchers. Field employees means all agricultural employees at the county level, including office help. But the employees above the county level are not exempted under my amendment.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. The appraisal of land is a seasonal occupation. Would your amendment exempt employees of the Farm Credit Administration and the Farmers Home Administration?

Mr. JENSEN. It exempts all seasonal and casual employees at the county level.

Mr. Chairman, I now have explained the difference between this amendment and the other similar amendments which I have offered and which the House previously has adopted, except in the last proviso where certain unnecessary language has been stricken which appeared in my other amendment of this nature.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. Oh, yes; I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I just wanted to point out that there is some difference in your amendment as offered today and the amendment you first offered to the first appropriation bill, which was the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill. You have eliminated from your amendment casual and seasonal workers. That was the same type of thing we had in the Labor and Federal Security Administration bill, under the Pure Food and Drug Act, where we hired temporary employees for mosquito control, which is the control of malaria in this country, and the gentleman refused to eliminate that and he refused to eliminate the Pure Food and Drug Administration, as he has eliminated the meat inspectors today, which does more for the health and protection of the food that we eat than any other agency.

Mr. JENSEN. I wish to elaborate on (d) and also on (g).

Exception (d) is recommended because unhampered seasonal employment authority is essential for handling of peak loads of work which occur in the production of woody plants and grass seed; application of conservation practics, and in farming operations on the research stations. Also in the case of fires on woodland and grassland areas owned by the Government, continuing authority must exist for on-the-spot employment of firefighters.

In connection with exception (g) I want to call attention to the report, page 13, Soil Conservation Service, Salaries and Expenses, which indicates that by the end of the fiscal year 1952 that 300 new soil-conservation districts will have to be served with somewhat less money than was available in the 1950 fiscal year. In addition, the Secretary of Agriculture in his Memorandum No. 1278—Coordination of the Department's Agricultural Resources Conservation Services—dated February 15, 1951, has assigned the responsibility for the technical phrases of the permanent type soil conservation work on the lands within a county to the Soil Conservation Service technician assigned to that county. This is deemed a highly desirable move on the part of the Secretary since it is aimed at assuring technical services to the agricultural conservation program of PMA for which we are appropriating a very considerable sum of money even with the cut recommended.

Thousands upon thousands of farmers have proved that the surest and safest way to ge and maintain high level production from our land is by practicing conservation farming. These same farmers have learned that they use less gas and oil, have less wear of their tractors and farming tools and that they waste less water, time, fertilizer, and seed when they farm the conservation way. A continuing high level farm production is a direct part of defense mobilization, and therefore, the conservation job must go on throughout the entire emergency period. For these reasons I have exempted the field employees—which means employees at the county level—of the Soil Conservation Service and Production Marketing Administration who provide conservation assistance direct to the farmers and ranchers. This exemption will of course also cover the clerical personnel in the field offices.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized to close debate.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I know it is exceedingly popular, and as we come to the conclusion of this debate, I want to say that I hope I have not said things during the consideration of this bill which appeared to be a little sharp, but this is much more serious than the case of where you are just registering a protest against the number of Government employees. The Congress set the number of employees and the number of days and hours per week which they should work. But during this war the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has attempted to exempt those that he can foresee might cause some trouble, but he cannot foresee all of them and he has not.

During this war emergency and in the changed conditions in the last several years we have got several thousand airplanes coming into this country every day from all parts of the world. They are not like ocean ships that have to land at the shore; they land over inside the country, and one out of three has got some insect or something that will do us harm if we let it get loose in this country. This means that even though we have held the total number of inspectors just as tight as we know, it means that only one out of four who may retire, or die, or go into the Army, can be replaced under this bill.

There are other examples just exactly like that. Let me read what this will mean in some instances: Of 153 offices of the Market News Service 103 are filled with only two people; one of these is a market reporter who develops data by visiting market places during trading hours, and the other is a clerk who stays in the office.

Of the 1,614 local offices of the Farmers Home Administration, 1,095 are staffed by only 2 people, a farm management supervisor and a clerk. Do you mean by this amendment that where the supervisor goes into the service for the next year that you can fill only one out of four such vacancies? Are you going to cut the Market News Service? Are you going to cripple all these organizations and stations which are run by two or three people?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows that this amendment permits transfers within the agency. They can do anything they want to; they can take 10 men or a hundred men.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am sorry; I cannot yield further. You can if you have the people to take, but when the total number has been reduced as low as it is now, where are you going to transfer them from? You have got to have some place to transfer them from.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What would happen in the case of the forest-fire lookouts during the summer season and fall when the forests are dry? It could mean possibly very large losses.

Mr. WHITTEN. I want to be absolutely fair; I want to say that my friend has exempted seasonal and casual workers. But we have got about a thousand forest-ranger districts staffed by permanent employees. During this fear of war we are afraid we may have some atomic bombs dropping on the country, and we have to make a constant effort to obviate damage to our public domain. What are you going to do? Only one out of four forest rangers who are separated from the service can be replaced. The gentleman says you can transfer them. Yes; transfer them from some other district, and what would that mean?

Then you have meat inspection; meat inspection is exempted; everybody is scared to fool with meat inspection. But we still have this amendment applying to our inspectors of livestock in the lots; they are not exempted from the provisions of this amendment.

Hog cholera research, where the work is carried on by one man cooperating with State experimental stations in the various States. Now, listen; you farmers know well how every year on our subcommittee one man after another wants something; to one it is tobacco; to another it is grapes; to another it is something in Lower California; little one- and two-man stations which are vital to an industry in a given area.

My friend by his amendment would say that only 1 out of 4 vacancies could be filled. What confusion it would cause. He says we could take them from elsewhere in the agency; we have not got them in the agency.

If you defeat this amendment, you are not voting to keep this Federal employment at a high rate. The record shows that since 1940 we have reduced the permanent employees of the Department of Agriculture from 808,000 down to less than 65,000. That is a good record. Do not close up house on your little stations in this country and then ask why the folks are getting on your back in your industries or you will be in trouble at home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired; all time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 123, noes 108.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WHITTEN and Mr. JENSEN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 135, noes 93.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the program for the balance of this week as well as next week, if he can so inform us.

Mr. McCORMACK. With the completion of the bill under consideration today there will be no program for the remainder of the week. I will ask unanimous consent to go over until Monday.

On Monday next there will be the call of the Consent Calendar with one suspension on S. 435, war-risk insurance for air commerce. I understand there is a unanimous commitee report, and it is quite important to get it through. There is no change in organic law to speak of, but it was not out of committee for 3 days to get on the Consent Calendar. The chances are that it will go through by unanimous consent, but I will put it down as a suspension, thus advising the Members that it will come up in any event.

There is a conference report which, if filed, will come up, but I do not know whether it will come up on Monday or not; if the chairman of the committee desires, it will come up on Monday.

If there are any roll calls, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and I have conferred and agreed that they will go over until Tuesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is quite all right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Tuesday and thereafter, until disposed of, we will take up H. R. 3791, the India emergency food relief bill, and after that H. R. 314, the Booker T. Washington Hospital of the Veterans' Administration. Any other program for next week, if any, will be announced later.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The India relief bill has 6 hours for general debate?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri: On page 58, line 5, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 410 (a) Except as hereinafter provided, reductions in each appropriation, reappropriation, loan and contract authorization or reauthorization contained in this act are hereby made in the total amount resulting from the application of the percentages indicated herein to the amounts of obligations for the fiscal year 1952, if any, included in the President's budget estimates on which each such appropriation, reappropriation, loan and contract authorization or reauthorization is based, for the following objects:

"Travel, 20 percent.

"Transportation of things, 10 percent.

"Communication services, 10 percent.

"Rents and utility services, 10 percent.

"Printing and reproduction, 10 percent.

"Other contractual services, 10 percent.

"Supplies and materials, 10 percent.

"Equipment, 10 percent.

"Lands and structures, 10 percent.

"Grants, subsidies, and contributions, 10 percent.

"(b) Amounts specifically authorized in this act to be transferred from one account to another, and limitations on such transfers, shall be subject to reduction as specified in this section only before such transfer is made, such reductions to be based on the schedules of obligations by objects, wherever appearing in the President's budget estimates, relating to such amounts.

"(c) For the purposes of this section the term 'President's budget estimates' shall be deemed to include the annual budget for the fiscal year 1952, any supplemental estimates transmitted to the Congress, and any information related to such budget or supplemental estimates.

"SEC. 411. The reductions provided for in this chapter shall not apply to the following:

"(a) Trust funds.

"(b) Funds received as payments in advance or otherwise for supplies furnished or services rendered.

"(c) Funds for Government corporations other than those made available in this act for administrative expenses or by direct appropriation for the general fund of the Treasury.

"(d) Amounts provided in this act for payment of obligations incurred under prior appropriations or authorization, and obligated balances of reappropriations.

"SEC. 412. Reductions below the amount of the President's budget estimates as made by any other section of this act in any appropriation, reappropriation, loan or contract authorization or reauthorization, or transfer authority contained herein shall be credited toward the respective reductions directed by this section."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. It requires the exercise of additional duties not required by any other law. Further, it is not protected by the Holman rule because any retrenchment of expenditures by the amendment is purely speculative, for any cuts are to be made on the basis of the figures in the President's budget. You cannot look at the bill and at the amendment and tell whether the amendment would reduce expenditures. This means it is speculative, and is not protected by the Holman rule. The bill now pending before the committee specifies certain amounts for specified purposes.

There is nothing in the bill before us which would indicate in the least whether it is a reduction, addition to, or anything else as far as the President's budget is concerned. The amendment which has been offered attempts to make reductions on the basis of figures in the President's budget, but that is not before us. I respectfully submit that while there may be retrenchment under the Holman rule, it has to be entirely apparent on the face of the amendment, rather than speculative. Therefore, the amendment is not saved by that rule.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. The reductions are absolutely specific in every instance, and the amount to which the reduction would apply is absolutely specific. Therefore, it is not speculative in the slightest degree. The reductions that are submitted are in different items of services, and other expenses that relate to the bill. There is no question at all of any speculation of the requirement of additional duties anywhere.

Mr. WHITTEN. Obviously, Mr. Chairman, duties additional to those imposed by any other law are required under the terms of the amendment—they are required even to effectuate the provisions of the amendment. The amendment does not name amounts or page and line numbers. Someone has to try to figure out how much money would be appropriated by the bill if the amendment were to become a part of the bill. That surely imposes on someone the duty of making computations, and the imposition of such duties is clearly sufficient to bring the amendment into the category of legislation.

Who can look at the bill before the House and look at the amendment which is before us and state the amount by which the amendment reduces the bill, if any? I cannot state the amount the amendments reduces the bill, or whether it reduces the bill. I may think it makes a reduction and a retrenchment—the author of the amendment may be confident that it does so. But under the precedents of the House if there is any doubt about retrenchment, then the amendment cannot be protected by the Holman rule. Notwithstanding the fact that the amendment starts off by saying that reductions are made, it would be necessary in order to compute the amount of the reductions to use something that is not here—it is not before us. In fact, some of it does not even exist.

Subsection c of the amendment says that the term "President's budget estimates" shall be deemed to include the annual budget and any supplemental estimates transmitted to Congress and also any information related to such budget or supplemental estimates. Those supplemental estimates can come here a month from now, and we can be confident that there will yet be amendments to the budget for 1952. They could reduce the budget as well as increase it. How can you base reductions on something that does not even exist yet? The amendment itself defines the term President's budget estimates" to include "any information related to such budget or supplemental estimates". If I publish a statement showing the objects of expenditure for every item in this bill to be zero—and say that it is the way some people would want it—would that not be "information related to the President's budget estimates"? If that information conflicts with the budget submitted by the President, which prevails? How could there be a more vague and indefinite reference?

Now tie all this in with the last proviso of this amendment. That states that reductions below the amount of the President's budget estimates as made by any other section of the act in any appropriation, et cetera, shall be credited toward the respective reductions directed by this amendment. The committee cut this bill 12.2 percent below the budget before it. If you credit this cut made by the committee to the reductions directed by this amendment, I believe you would have a net increase in the bill as it now stands. How does that work out so as to retrench expenditures? Surely, any retrenchment is speculative, and under the precedents that means the point of order must be sustained.

Under the precedents and the rules, the Chair may look only to what is properly of record in the pending bill, which is the bill under consideration, the law of the land and the practice of the House. The budget is not here—in fact some of it may not even exist yet, under the definition in the amendment itself.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has already referred to it, but I would like to emphasize that the budget of the President and the budget estimates in relation to the Department of Agriculture are not before the House of Representatives. The House is now considering a bill, and the estimates as contained in the budget are simply sent here and referred to the Committee on Appropriations for its consideration as a piece of evidence and no more. We are not considering the budget estimate. We are considering a bill. How an amendment can relate to budget estimates and yet be germane to the pending bill is not quite clear to me. It seems to me that the point of order raised by the gentleman from Mississippi is well taken on the two grounds he has mentioned, that it is not a limitation of expenditures for the reasons he has stated and also that it is not saved by the Holman rule.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not have the amendment before me, but I recall there is reference in it to cutting the bill. But the formula used in cutting the bill is in relation to the President's budget and by applying the provisions of the amendment to that budget. I respectfully submit that while there may be that reference in the amendment to cutting the bill, it does not change the force of the argument which I advanced that the budget is not before the House and therefore the amendment is not in order.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard a little further on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the President's budget was submitted to the Congress about the 20th of January, and of course it is presently before the Congress. The intent of this amendment is to reduce travel expenditures where they are above 20 percent below the President's budget on that item of traveling. On the other things it is absolutely specific. It does not in the slightest degree or in any case increase an item, but it would prohibit an expenditure of more than a certain percent on each item below the President's budget as submitted to us. There can be no question but what it is entirely within the purview of the rule and that it is entirely specific and does not require additional duties.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard just briefly?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would like to call the attention of the Chair, if I may, to the fact that, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has said, the President's budget is a part of the official records of this House and is used constantly by the House as a guide and an official document. This amendment that has been submitted by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] simply places a limitation upon the appropriation bill and gives a directive as to how the funds shall be expended, using as a guide only the figures set out in the President's budget. Therefore, the amendment should be in order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FORAND). The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. PHILLIPS. May I be heard, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The point is made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] that the budget is before the Congress. That does not hold true in this instance, because this is not the House meeting as the House. It is the Committee of the Whole, and the Committee is meeting to consider a bill having to do with appropriations for the Department of Agriculture.

After very serious study on this amendment, the Chair is of the opinion that this is legislation on an appropriation bill, and the question then arises as to whether it is protected by the Holman rule. That rule requires the legislation to make a retrenchment of expenditures beyond doubt. Since this amendment operates against the budget estimates rather than the amounts in the bill, the question of retrenchment is speculative.

Therefore, the Chair holds that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is legislation upon an appropriation bill and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry my amendment was not ruled germane. My approach to this is entirely apart from agriculture or any other field. The fact remains that the Department of Agriculture is the only department according to the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report that has accomplished zero percent of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. The recommendations all lie along the line of improving the administration of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am in accord with some of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. However, I cannot help but say that I doubt that you ought to saddle that on the Department. The Congress has to change the law. For the time being they have to operate under the law as it is.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not agree with that. A great many recommendations can be made and a great many reductions should be made through administrative procedure. Further it behooves the executive department to submit something to Congress in the way of recommendations to act upon. In fact the Reorganization Act calls upon the Executive to submit reorganization plans to the Congress.

The Hoover Commission recommendations for the Department of Agriculture would save about $80,000,000. The amendment I sought to offer would have reduced the budget by about $70,000,000, which would have been in accord with the idea of the Hoover Commission to put the Department on a business basis.

Further, I want to state that unless the Congress is ready and willing to do something, when a department has so thumbed its nose at the people's desire for economy and efficiency, and this Congress, by refusing to comply with any of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and has a zero percentage of compliance, there is no chance of ever controlling Federal expenditures. Something should be done by this Congress. One thing that can be done is when an appropriation bill comes around we can cut the appropriation and so accomplish that purpose. That was the purpose of my amendment.

The amendment I proposed to the Agriculture Appropriation Act of 1952 would have reduced the appropriation in the President's budget estimates by $89,000,000. With the amendments proposed heretofore and adopted this would result in a net cut of around $70,000,000 in the bill. The cut is a percentage cut across the board on all administrative items plus a percentage cut on the general item "Grants, subsidies, and contributions" as set out on page 1123 of the hearings before the subcommittee.

The wording of this amendment is the result of some considerable study and research on the part of various persons interested in it. It seeks to eliminate the objections raised to the Thomas-Taber amendment in Senate conference in the Eighty-first Congress. Furthemore, it is restricted to an appropriation bill for a single department and is accordingly itemized.

I cannot understand the Chair's ruling in light of these facts and the further facts that the President's Budget is set out in both the subcommittee printed hearings and the printed report No. 421 accompanying H. R. 3973.

Frankly, on general principles, I am opposed to percentage cut amendments. They are too apt to cut the good along with the bad.

However, I support this amendment on the very strong basis that the Department of Agriculture according to the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report is the only Cabinet department in which no basic recommendations of the Hoover Commission have been applied by legislation, reorganization plan, or administrative action. The committee, of which I am a member, Executive Expenditures, has the job to further the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

Most of you have read the very detailed report of the Hoover Commission and its active subcommittee on the Department of Agriculture. It was made by men who knew their field. It is fair and it is sound. It is estimated that at least $80,000,000 could be saved annually by the Department of Agriculture if its recommendations were adopted. Furthermore, an annual rescission of $135,000,000 could be made to the Federal Treasury and $2,530,000,000 returned to the Treasury almost immediately through liquidations, and relinquishment of certain borrowing powers.

The question before the House, as I have said, is this, are we going to permit a department of the executive branch of our Government to thumb its nose at the people and the Congress in these days when we so badly need to restrict waste and inefficiency?

What will be the effect on the executive branch of the Government if this Congress permits a governmental department to get by unchecked when it has a zero record of compliance with sound recommendations for efficiency and economy, which incidentally will not impair any of the services now being performed, but in fact will enhance them through more efficient operation? Will there be any incentive for the further compliance by the Federal agencies with the Hoover Commission recommendations if the Congress sits idly by and fails to take the one kind of action it has available? That action I need hardly state is to cut the appropriation of the agency when the opportunity comes around. The opportunity is now here.

In my opinion a vote for this amendment is a vote for the Hoover Commission's objectives. A vote against this amendment renders ineffectual the great work of this Commission and of the Congress which set it up.

The subcommittee's cuts, it should be noted, have little or nothing to do with the cuts proposed in this amendment: $80,000,000 of the subcommittee's total cut of roughly $100,000,000 concerns three items: a $32,700,000 item which merely changes the bookkeeping and the other two items which cut back specific programs—see schedule pages 32 and 35 of subcommittee report.

The amount proposed to be cut from Agriculture's budget by this amendment is less than the amount that Agriculture can save by putting its house in order. Let me read the general findings of the Hoover Commission on the deficiencies of the Department of Agriculture:

Our task force on agricultural activities enumerates the following faults in the organization of the Department:

(a) Its rapid growth has resulted in some 20 different offices reporting directly to the Secretary, causing an unnecessary diffusion of authority.

(b) The Department has grown to its present size without sufficient integration of its parts and with considerable overlap and duplication. It is a loose confederation of independent bureaus and agencies.

(c) There are agricultural activities in other parts of the Government which overlap and duplicate those of the Department of Agriculture.

(d) The Cooperative Extension Service established by the Federal Government and the States for educational purposes is being increasingly bypassed by several of the bureaus and agencies of the Department.

(e) With the rapid growth of new activities, many field organizations at State and county levels have developed. Their work results in duplications, overlappings, and often conflicting policies. They confuse and multiply the difficulties of the farmer in his relations to the Department.

(f) The Department has organized a variety of local advisory committees at the county level, and their members tend to become local administrators of uncoordinated agencies instead of advisors.

(g) The inspection of agricultural products for protection of the consumer and the farmer is scattered through many agencies of the Government, and the resulting confusion requires producers and manufacturers to comply with regulations issued by agencies of two or more departments or administrations.

(h) The present systems of budgeting, treatment of intradepartmental funds, and earmarking of recurring funds have the cumulative effect of obscuring bureau expenditures and of promoting waste.

(i) The services and policies of the several farm credit agencies overlap. Their organization is contrary to sound banking principles. Some of them make loans which require costly individual supervision.

CONCLUSIONS

These recommendations, if accepted, would result in the elimination of overlap and conflict. They are designed to give greater efficiency and economy to the administration of the Department. Estimates, which are admittedly approximations, have been made of the amounts which might be saved by taking the actions recommended. The tabulation on page 95 of the report of our task force on agricultural activities reveals that the total specific annual savings in operating expenses by functional reorganization, as estimated by the task force, amount to over $44,000,000.

Further, by adoption of our recommendations as to credit agencies an annual saving of more than $36,000,000 can be made to the Government, the Government losses on loans can be lessened, and the Government capital now employed by lending agencies can be reduced.

Consequential returns can be made to the Treasury of funds now in the hands of agricultural credit agencies, and by the reduction of borrowing authorities.

This Commission believes useless duplication to the citizen will be eliminated, and economy to both the Government and the citizen will result from these recommendations.

If ever there was an opportunity to put yourself on record for efficiency and economy, it was now. However, the adverse ruling by the Chair has deprived us all of this opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

(Mr. CURTIS of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

COST OF RAISING BEEF

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, it has been charged that representatives of the livestock-producing industry made a very bad case for themselves in a recent public meeting here in Washington. It is charged that they were unable to answer certain questions regarding the cost of producing livestock. However, there is another delegation in Washington at this time, headed by Frederick Sherer, president of the Nebraska's Feeder Association, who has presented a full study and analysis of beef-production costs to many Members of the House and the Senate. The final calculations of the study were made by a committee of the association, with William S. Brown, of Sioux City, Iowa, livestock market, as chairman. This study gives full detail in nine exhibits, and the explanations of these exhibits, in my opinion, answer most of the questions which were not answered at the recent public hearing here in Washington. Mr. Sherer and his associates are appearing before the House Committee on Agriculture and also the House Committee on Banking and Currency, during which time the beef-production costs will be explained in detail. Fearing, however, that very few Members of the House will be given the opportunity to study these exhibits, I include the explanations as part of my remarks:

"When you can measure what you are speaking about, and express it in numbers, you know something about it; but when you cannot measure it, when you cannot express it in numbers, your knowledge is of a meager and unsatisfactory kind."—Selected.

With this thought in mind the following exhibits have been prepared to show the costs involved in cattle-feeding operations. From a study of these exhibits a measure can be made on the over-all costs involved in cattle feeding. One of the basic fallacies of Ceiling Price Regulation 23 dated April 30, 1951, issued by the Office of Price Stabilization is the lack of consideration given to the costs involved in producing the gain on cattle in the feed lot.

EXPLANATIONS OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit No. 1. This exhibit is a recapitulation of basic data obtained from 20 different farmer feeders. These men prepared individual forms and the costs shown in this exhibit are actual costs as per their own experience. Out of some 300 separate cost sheets submitted, 20 were selected for the basis of this exhibit. These were more or less selected at random but an effort was always made to take the most conservative and reasonable set of costs for this study. In most cases the operations studied consisted of cattle now actually in the feed lot and are being headed for the late spring or summer market.

Exhibit No. 2. This exhibit is set up on the basis of an analysis of cost components and is comparable to a cost accounting sheet of a factory operation. All figures used are based on the data spread in exhibit No. 1. In a sense exhibit No. 2 is a study of a beef factory and should be analyzed as such. It should be noted that the gain cost in this exhibit is $35.619 per hundredweight to break even and $36.643 per hundredweight in order to yield a profit of $23.26 per head. This $23.26 per head is about 5 percent of the break-even cost of the finished steer which costs $424.96 per head to build. If the formula of cost plus 10 percent were followed, the steer should show a per head profit of $42.49. To yield this, it would have to sell approximately $2 per hundredweight higher than the figure shown of $36.643, the necessary selling price required to recover out-of-pocket expense and provide a profit of $23.26 per head. The Ceiling Price Regulation 23 order reflects around a 20-percent roll-back on selling prices as of October 1, 1951, compared to actual selling levels the date of issuance of the order, April 30. Yet, no provision is made to roll back the gain costs 20 percent. Many experienced cattle feeders state that this gain cost will increase, not decrease. (See last paragraph of Exhibit No. 8) if such is the case, production will be sharply curtailed and in some instances stopped.

Exhibit No. 3. This exhibit is a per head breakdown of costs based on the factual information gathered from the farmer feeder. This is the same information on a per head basis as shown in exhibit No. 2. This exhibit follows the same pattern of set-up as the form prepared by the feeder himself, and is a composite on the 1742 head shown from the 20 different operations on a per head basis. The provision for a profit of $23.26 per head is very low and many operators would not be satisfied with this, nevertheless, in the lots tested this in the mean figure resulting from the actual figure specified by the men themselves.

Exhibit No. 4. This exhibit shows the break-even cost calculation, also the total amount to be recovered. The basis for these calculations appear in exhibits Nos. 2 and 3. The miscellaneous calculations in this exhibit show that the per bushel yield of beef to be 7.3 pounds. This yield would not be possible except for the fact that some of the operations used in these exhibits (No. 2 and No. 3) are a grass-feeding project which of course, "stretches" the corn. Such a yield from 1 bushel of corn would not be possible in a late fall or winter-feeding program when no grass is available. It is interesting to note that the average daily gain is 2.27 pounds which shows the operators made no attempt to minimize the gain for the feed fed.

Exhibit No. 5. This exhibit is a spread of factual information taken off of actual reports turned in by 18 different feeders. The 18 lots tested in this and exhibit No. 4 are separate and apart from those shown in exhibits No. 2 and No. 3. The purpose of this exhibit is to show that costs are much higher in certain operations than others, particularly so when contrasted to those used in the first three exhibits. Note that the cost of gain on these cattle is $43.60 per hundredweight. These cattle were fed strictly in the dry lot (no grass) and high-priced rations.

Exhibit No. 6. This exhibit shows the per head analysis of costs involved based on data in exhibit No. 5. This exhibit compares to exhibit No. 4, only on different lots of cattle tested. This calculation shows that the animal must sell for $38.30 to recover out-of-pocket expenses and produce a profit. By comparison this shows that gain costs to break even are $43.60 per hundredweight compared to $35.62 in exhibit No. 4. It has to be admitted that the cattle tested in exhibits No. 2, No. 3, and No. 4 show very low costs and are very conservative; also that the experiences of many other feeders show that out-of-pocket costs are much higher.

Exhibit No. 7. This exhibit is self-explanatory. The main difference between this exhibit and the preceding is that this reflects a completed operation. Note dates of the feeding period. These costs are actual experience of a commercial operator in Nebraska. Note that the gain cost is $39.70 per hundredweight on 2,162 head out of 6 different lots.

Exhibit No. 8. This exhibit is self-explanatory and also reflects a completed operation of a commercial feeder in Colorado. Note his per hundredweight gain cost of $40.99 to break even.

Exhibit No. 9. This exhibit shows the selling prices of live cattle at the various dates as indicated in the column headings. The prices that become effective August 1, 1951, are 4½ percent lower than the May 20 level. The October 1, 1951, price schedule is around 4½ percent under the August 1 level. The October 1 level will reflect approximately 120 percent to 125 percent of parity according to ceiling price regulation 23.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Naturally, I accept the ruling of the Chair. But I respectfully say, in view of the possibility of a similar point of order, any time in the future, what I tried to say to the Chair before he ruled: If he will look on page 1 of the bill he will see that when a bill comes to this floor it carries with it a report, and the report number is printed on the face of the bill. The report, accompanying H. R. 3973, on page 34, carries the figures of the President's budget, and compares them with the figures in this bill. Therefore, I tried to say to the Chair that the President's budget is a part of this bill before us.

I am afraid this ruling is an example of the effect of the so-called functional budget, and suggests one difficulty of saving money under a functional budget. I think that is something for us to consider as other bills come to the floor.

INCREASE RAILROAD RETIREMENT BENEFITS

(Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point of the RECORD.)

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, it is very gratifying to me to know that the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is at the present time conducting hearings on amending the Railroad Retirement Act. Probably no group of people in the United States are more in need of immediate consideration by the Congress than those unfortunates living on fixed incomes in this time of inflationary pressures. Those who are receiving benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act are, of course, among this group and are suffering great hardship.

I feel certain that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce made up as it is of experts in the field of railroad retirement, will expeditiously report

a bill granting relief for the railroad pensioners. It is my sincere hope that in framing a bill that the committee will give serious consideration to the problem of men who have retired under the railroad retirement system who have wives to support. As we all know, the Congress in its wisdom, in amending the Social Security Act in 1939, recognized the additional financial responsibility of an annuitant burdened with the responsibility of caring for a wife. Therefore, in the social security field we have established a principle of allowing a married annuitant a financial consideration to enable him to meet his responsibility.

H. R. 3669, as proposed by the Railway Labor Executives' Association, takes steps to correct this problem as it affects railroad employees. This bill makes an allowance for the spouse of an annuitant of one-half his annuity up to a maximum of $50. It seems to me only fair that the Congress apply the same principle in the field of railroad retirement that it has seen fit to apply in social security.

There is no question but what the needs of single annuitants and married annuitants are dissimilar. Consideration for the wife in the manner prescribed by H. R. 3669 is an equitable approach. I sincerely hope that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will adopt this feature when it reports a bill.

Mr McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a further brief announcement to the House. It was intended to bring up this afternoon House Resolution 158 to authorize the Committee on Public Works to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of the said committee. Instead of bringing that up there will be called up House Concurrent Resolution 100, to provide for an appropriate ceremony in the rotunda of the Capitol in honor of Constantini Brumidi. I understand there is no objection to this resolution. House Resolution 158 will be called up on Monday.

I wanted to make this announcement so the Members would understand the situation.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Jensen amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 58, after line 4 insert a new section as follows:

"No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within the agency;

"(c) to offices or position required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to seasonal and casual workers;

"(e) to meet inspectors;

"(f) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2;

"(g) to field employees of the Soil Conservation Service and Production Marketing Administration who provide conservation assistance to farmers and ranchers.

"*Provided further*, That when any department or agency covered in this act has reduced their employment rolls to 80 percent of the total number on their rolls as of July 1, 1951, this limitation may cease to apply."

Mr. JENSEN (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with but that it be printed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, on this I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 214, nays 153, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

YEAS—214

Aandahl
Abbitt
Abernethy
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Andresen, August H.
Andrews
Arends
Armstrong
Auchincloss
Ayres
Bakewell
Bates, Mass.
Battle
Beall
Belcher
Bender
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bishop
Blackney
Boggs, Del.
Bolton
Bow
Boykin
Bramblett
Brehm
Brown, Ohio
Bryson
Budge
Buffett
Burleson
Burton
Busbey
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Camp
Canfield
Case
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clevenger
Cole, Kans.
Cooper
Cotton
Coudert
Cox
Crawford
Cunningham
Curtis, Mo.
Curtis, Nebr.
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Davis, Wis.
Denny
Devereux
Dolliver
Dondero
Donovan
Doughton
Elston
Engle
Fallon
Fellows
Fenton
Fisher
Ford
Forrester
Frazier
Fugate
Fulton
Gamble
Gathings
Gavin
George
Golden
Gossett
Graham
Gross
Gwinn
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hand
Harden
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Harrison, Wyo.
Hébert
Herter
Heselton
Hess
Hill
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Hull
Hunter
Jackson, Calif.
James
Jarman
Jenison
Jenkins
Jensen
Jonas
Jones, Woodrow W.
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kennedy
Kilburn
LeCompte
Lovre
McConnell
McCulloch
McDonough
McGregor
McVey
Mack, Wash.
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Meader
Merrow
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Morano
Morton
Mumma
Murray, Tenn.
Nelson
Nicholson
Norblad
O'Hara
Ostertag
Patten
Patterson
Phillips
Pickett
Potter
Poulson
Prouty
Radwan
Rankin
Reams
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Regan
Ribicoff
Riehlman
Robeson
Rogers, Mass.
Sadlak
St. George
Saylor
Schwabe
Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Scrivner
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Sheehan
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Sittler
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Stefan
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Teague
Thompson, Mich.
Tollefson
Towe
Vail
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vaughn
Velde
Vorys
Vursell
Walter
Weichel
Werdel
Wharton
Wheeler
Widnall
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. Y.
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wood, Ga.

NAYS—153

Addonizio
Albert
Allen, La.
Anfuso
Aspinall
Baring
Barrett
Bates, Ky.
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Bentsen
Blatnik
Boggs, La.
Bolling
Breen
Brown, Ga.
Burdick
Burnside
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Celler
Chatham
Chelf
Clemente
Combs
Cooley
Crosser
DeGraffenried
Delaney
Denton
Dollinger
Donohue
Doyle
Durham
Eberharter
Elliott
Evins
Feighan
Fernandez
Fine
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Furcolo
Garmatz
Gary
Gordon
Gore
Granger
Grant
Greenwood
Gregory
Hardy
Hart
Havenner
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Heffernan
Heller
Herlong
Holifield
Howell
Javits
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, Hamilton C.
Karsten, Mo.
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kerr
King
Klein
Kluczynski
Lane
Lanham
Lantaff
Larcade
Lesinski
Lind
Lucas
McCarthy
McCormack
McGuire
McKinnon
McMillan
McMullen
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Mahon
Mansfield
Marshall
Mills
Mitchell
Morris
Morrison
Moulder
Multer
Murdock
Murphy
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Toole
Passman
Patman
Philbin
Polk
Powell
Preston
Price
Priest
Quinn
Rabaut
Rains
Ramsay
Rhodes
Riley
Rodino

Rogers, Colo.	Staggers	Whitaker
Rogers, Fla.	Steed	Whitten
Rooney	Stigler	Wickersham
Roosevelt	Sutton	Wier
Sabath	Tackett	Willis
Sasscer	Thomas	Winstead
Shelley	Thompson, Tex.	Withrow
Sieminski	Thornberry	Yorty
Sikes	Trimble	Zablocki
Smith, Miss.	Watts	
Spence	Welch	

NOT VOTING—65

Adair	D'Ewart	Lyle
Angell	Dingell	McGrath
Bailey	Dorn	Magee
Baker	Eaton	Miller, Calif.
Barden	Ellsworth	Morgan
Beamer	Gillette	Murray, Wis.
Bonner	Goodwin	O'Neill
Bosone	Granahan	Perkins
Bray	Green	Poage
Brooks	Hall,	Redden
Brownson	Leonard W.	Richards
Buckley	Halleck	Rivers
Butler	Harvey	Roberts
Byrne, N. Y.	Hedrick	Rogers, Tex.
Chudoff	Irving	Secrest
Cole, N. Y.	Jackson, Wash.	Sheppard
Colmer	Johnson	Stanley
Corbett	Judd	Stockman
Crumpacker	Kersten, Wis.	Vinson
Dawson	Kilday	Wood, Idaho
Deane	Kirwan	Woodruff
Dempsey	Latham	Yates

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. McGrath against.
Mr. Baker for, with Mr. Granahan against.
Mr. Latham for, with Mr. Irving against.
Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Jackson of Washington against.
Mr. Crumpacker for, with Mr. Chudoff against.
Mr. Adair for, with Mr. Green against.
Mr. Brownson for, with Mr. Buckley against.
Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Miller of California against.
Mr. Bray for, with Mr. Kirwan against.
Mr. Beamer for, with Mr. Brooks against.
Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Roberts against.
Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. Redden against.
Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Perkins against.
Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. O'Neil against.
Mr. Goodwin for, with Mr. Deane against.
Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Bailey against.
Mr. Corbett for, with Mrs. Bosone against.
Mr. Dempsey for, with Mr. Sheppard against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Lyle with Mr. Angell.
Mr. Hedrick with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Magee with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Kilday with Mr. D'Ewart.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Wood of Idaho.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Johnson.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill just passed the enrolling clerk be authorized to make any necessary correction of section numbers.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think this House ought to work now and get out of here in July.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILBURN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I state to the gentleman from New York that there is no further legislation this week.

Mr. KILBURN. What about the aid to India bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is to be taken up on Tuesday.

Mr. KILBURN. Why not take it up tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a matter for the leadership on this side to program. It is done after consultation. All you are doing is to force the Members to come back here tomorrow to adjourn.

Mr. KILBURN. I will not object this time, but I am serving notice that we ought to work and get out of here.

Mr. McCORMACK. We are ready to work. We are caught up on everything.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There is not anything to prevent any Member working on his committee work or attending to his office work, if he wants to work, is there?

The SPEAKER. That is hardly a parliamentary inquiry.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I submit a resolution (H. Res. 235) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That PAT SUTTON, of Tennessee, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives of the District of Columbia.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative business of the day and the special orders heretofore entered.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

CHARGES AGAINST DR. JOSEPH W. WEINBERG

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, the dismissal of contempt-of-court charges against Dr. Joseph W. Weinberg in Judge Holtzoff's court, in my opinion, calls up an immediate need for a review of the case by the Department of Justice, as recommended by the Un-American Activities Committee by a unanimous vote that Dr. Weinberg be investigated with view to perjury indictment.

I have no quarrel with the ruling of Judge Holtzoff. I am not too familiar with the details of the contempt charge on which Weinberg was acquitted, but feel that the ruling was made on ample legal precedent. A reading of the testimony of Dr. Joseph W. Weinberg when he appeared before the Un-American Activities Committee in 1949 and 1950 should convince any fair-minded person that Dr. Weinberg is not cooperating with his Government providing all the details of his connections with Steve Nelson and other members of the Communist Party in the San Francisco Bay area during his employ in the University of California Radiation Laboratories as a nuclear physicist. A further reading of the testimony of witnesses before the Un-American Activities Committee, especially that of Mr. James Sterling Murray, would indicate that Weinberg had many connections with Steve Nelson and other Communist Party members, which he has thus far denied. So I urge the Department of Justice, with the help of the FBI, to renew their efforts to bring before a grand jury the full facts concerning Weinberg. It has been a year and 10 months now since the Un-American Activities Committee unanimously recommended consideration by the Department of Justice of Weinberg's testimony. We should not allow this matter to be delayed any further.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tomorrow to file a conference report on the bill H. R. 3587, the third supplemental appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 21 (legislative day, MAY 17), 1951

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

TITLE I—REGULAR ACTIVITIES

RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946

To enable the Secretary to improve and develop, independently or through cooperation among Federal and

1 State agencies, and others, a sound and efficient system for
2 the distribution and marketing of agricultural products under
3 the provisions of titles II and III of the Act of August
4 14, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1621–1629), $4,700,000:
5 *Provided*, That not less than $600,000 of this amount shall
6 be available for contracts in accordance with the provisions
7 of section 205 of said Act: *Provided further*, That
8 the Secretary may make available to any bureau,
9 office, or agency of the Department such amounts
10 from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry
11 out the functions for which it is made (but amounts
12 made available to the Office of the Secretary, Office of the
13 Solicitor, and Office of Information, shall not exceed those
14 which the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon
15 with representatives of the Department, shall determine),
16 and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts trans-
17 ferred or otherwise made available to other appropriation
18 items of the Department: *Provided further*, That no part
19 of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to
20 fish or shellfish or any product thereof, except for the sup-
21 port of equitable transportation rates before Federal agen-
22 cies concerned with such rates and for development of foreign
23 markets.

1 BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

2 For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of
3 the Act establishing the Bureau of Agricultural Economics
4 (7 U. S. C. 411) and related Acts, as follows:

5 Economic investigations: For conducting investigations
6 and for acquiring and diffusing useful information among the
7 people of the United States, relative to agricultural pro-
8 duction, distribution, land utilization, and conservation in
9 their broadest aspects, including farm management and prac-
10 tice, utilization of farm and food products, purchasing of farm
11 supplies, farm population and rural life, farm labor, farm
12 finance, insurance and taxation, adjustments in production
13 to probable demand for the different farm and food products;
14 land ownership and values, costs, prices and income in their
15 relation to agriculture, including causes for their variations
16 and trends, $2,000,000: *Provided,* That no part of the
17 funds herein appropraited or made available to the Bureau
18 of Agricultural Economics under the heading "Economic
19 investigations" shall be used for State and county land-use
20 planning, for conducting cultural surveys, or for the main-
21 tenance of regional offices.

22 Crop and livestock estimates: For collecting, compiling
23 abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and pub-

1 lishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and live-
2 stock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, staples of cotton,
3 stocks, and value of farm crops and numbers, grades, and
4 value of livestock and livestock products on farms, pro-
5 duction, distribution, and consumption of turpentine and
6 rosin pursuant to the Act of August 15, 1935 (5 U. S. C.
7 556b), and for the collection and publication of statistics
8 of peanuts as provided by the Act approved June 24, 1936,
9 as amended May 12, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 951–957),
10 $2,850,000: *Provided,* That no part of the funds herein
11 appropriated shall be available for any expense incident
12 to ascertaining, collating, or publishing a report stating the
13 intention of farmers as to the acreage to be planted in cotton,
14 or for estimates of apple production for other than the
15 commercial crop.

16 AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

17 OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

18 For necessary expenses of the Office of Administrator,
19 including travel and subsistence expenses of advisory com-
20 mittees authorized by title III of the Act of August 14, 1946
21 (7 U. S. C. 1628–1629), and the maintenance, operation,
22 and furnishing of facilities and services at the Agricultural
23 Research Center, $560,000: *Provided,* That the appro-
24 priation current at the time services are rendered may
25 be reimbursed (by advance credits or reimbursements

1 based on estimated or actual charges) from applicable appro-
2 priations, to cover the charges, including handling and other
3 related services, for equipment rentals (including depre-
4 ciation, maintenance, and repairs); for services, supplies,
5 equipment, and material furnished: *Provided further,* That
6 of the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research
7 Administration, not to exceed $15,000 shall be available
8 for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section
9 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as
10 amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
11 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further,* That the several appro-
12 priations of the Agricultural Research Administration shall
13 be available for the construction, alteration, and repair of
14 buildings and improvements: *Provided, however,* That unless
15 otherwise provided, the cost of constructing any one build-
16 ing (excepting headhouses connecting greenhouses and
17 experimental farm houses) shall not exceed $5,000, the
18 total amount for construction of buildings costing more
19 than $2,500 each shall be within the limits of the esti-
20 mates submitted and approved therefor, and the cost of
21 altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not
22 exceed $2,500 or 2 per centum of the cost of the building
23 as certified by the Research Administrator, whichever is
24 greater: *Provided further,* That not to exceed 7 per centum
25 of the funds of any research appropriation of the Agricul-

1 tural Research Administration, including the appropriation
2 for the Office of the Administrator, may be transferred by
3 the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary, to
4 any other such research appropriation in order to provide
5 for a more effective research program: *Provided, however,*
6 That no appropriation may be increased more than 7 per
7 centum by such transfers.

8 RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA

9 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to con-
10 duct research into the basic agricultural needs and problems
11 of the Territory of Alaska, through such agencies of the De-
12 partment as he may designate, independently or in coopera-
13 tion with appropriate agencies of the Territory of Alaska,
14 $250,000.

15 OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

16 Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico

17 For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto
18 Rico to be paid quarterly in advance where applicable, to
19 carry into effect the provisions of the following Acts relating
20 to agricultural experiment stations:

21 Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related
22 Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7
23 U. S. C. 362, 363, 365, 368, 377–379), $720,000; Adams
24 Act, the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369),
25 $720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24,

1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373–376, 380, 382), $2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), sections 3 and 5, $2,863,708, and sections 9 and 11 of said Act as added by the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427h, 427j), including administration by the Office of Experiment Stations in the United States Department of Agriculture, $5,000,000, no part of which latter amount shall be used for beginning construction of any building costing in excess of $15,000, except that a poultry breeding house may be constructed at Purdue University at a cost to this appropriation of not to exceed $29,000; Hawaii, the Act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386–386b), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii, $90,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Hatch Act to the Territory of Alaska, $15,000, and the provisions of section 2 of the Act approved June 20, 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 369a, Public Law 739, approved August 29, 1950), extending the benefits of the Adams and Purnell Acts to the Territory of Alaska, $37,500; Puerto Rico, the Act approved March 4, 1931, as amended (7 U. S. C. 386d–386f), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, $12,416,208.

1 Salaries and Expenses

2 For necessary expenses in connection with administra-
3 tion of grants and coordination of research with States pur-
4 suant to the Acts approved March 2, 1887, March 16, 1906,
5 February 24, 1925, May 16, 1928, February 23, 1929,
6 March 4, 1931, and June 20, 1936, and Acts amendatory
7 thereto (7 U. S. C. 361–363, 365–383, 386–386f), and
8 title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended by
9 the Act of September 21, 1944 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g),
10 and for the administration, operation, and maintenance of
11 an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, $390,000;
12 and the Secretary shall prescribe the form of the annual
13 financial statement required under the above Acts, ascertain
14 whether the expenditures are in accordance with their pro-
15 visions, coordinate the research work of the State agricul-
16 tural colleges and experiment stations in the lines authorized
17 in said Acts with research of the Department in similar
18 lines, and make report thereon to Congress.

19 BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

20 For necessary expenses in connection with conducting
21 investigations of the relative utility and economy of agri-
22 cultural products for food, clothing, and other uses in the
23 home, with special suggestions of plans and methods for
24 the more effective utilization of such products for these
25 purposes, and such economic investigations, including

1 housing and household buying, as have for their purpose
2 the improvement of the rural home, for coordinating nutri-
3 tion services made available by Federal, State, and other
4 agencies, and for disseminating useful information on these
5 subjects, $1,350,000.

6 BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

7 Salaries and Expenses

8 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
9 the Act, as amended, establishing a Bureau of Animal
10 Industry, and related Acts, and for investigation concerned
11 with the livestock and meat industries and the domestic
12 raising of fur-bearing animals, as follows:

13 Animal research: For animal husbandry investigations;
14 investigations of diseases of animals and of tuberculin,
15 serums, antitoxins, and analogous products; and cooperation
16 in the administration of regulations for the improvement of
17 poultry, poultry products, and hatcheries, as authorized by
18 law (7 U. S. C. 429, Public Law 662, approved August 4,
19 1950); $3,200,700.

20 Animal disease control and eradication: For the control
21 and eradication of tuberculosis and paratuberculosis of ani-
22 mals, avian turberculosis, Bang's disease of cattle, scabies
23 in sheep and cattle, southern cattle ticks, hog cholera and
24 related swine diseases, and dourine in horses, and other

1 inspection and quarantine work authorized by law; for
2 supervision of the transportation of livestock, including
3 administration of the twenty-eight-hour law; for inspection
4 of vessels; and for carrying out the provisions of the Act
5 of March 4, 1913 (21 U. S. C. 151–158), relating to
6 veterinary biological products, $7,750,000, including $30,000
7 for the acquisition of land and construction of buildings for
8 inspection of livestock at Canadian border ports of entry:
9 *Provided,* That no payment hereunder as compensation
10 for any cattle condemned for slaughter for tuberculosis,
11 paratuberculosis, or Bang's disease shall exceed (1) $25
12 for any grade animal or $50 for any pure bred animal,
13 (2) one-third of the difference between the appraised value
14 and the value of salvage thereof, or (3) the amount paid
15 or to be paid by the State or other cooperating agency,
16 and no payment hereunder shall be made for any animal
17 if at the time of test or condemnation it shall belong
18 to or be upon the premises of any person, firm, or corpora-
19 tion to which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered for
20 slaughter.

21 Marketing agreements, hog cholera virus and serum:
22 For carrying into effect sections 56 to 60, inclusive, of the
23 Act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 851–855)
24 regulating the marketing of anti-hog-cholera serum and hog-
25 cholera virus, $49,300.

1 Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of
2 laws relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat-food
3 products, including the purchase of one passenger motor
4 vehicle for replacement only, $12,800,000: *Provided,* That
5 hereafter reimbursement may be made by any person, firm,
6 or organization for the expenses of meat inspection in excess
7 of those which can be met from the amount appropriated
8 for such purposes each year.

9 BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

10 For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions
11 of the Act of May 29, 1924 (7 U. S. C. 401–404), includ-
12 ing investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in dairy
13 industry, the applicable provisions of the Act of May 9,
14 1902 (26 U. S. C. 2325, 2326 (c)), relating to process
15 or renovated butter, as amended, and the Act of May 23,
16 1908 (21 U. S. C. 94 (a)), insofar as it relates to the
17 exportation of process or renovated butter, $1,450,000.

18 BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

19 For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments,
20 and demonstrations established under the provisions of sec-
21 tion 202 (a) to 202 (e), inclusive, of title II of the Agri-
22 cultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1292); for the
23 development of new and extended food, feed, and industrial
24 uses for agricultural commodities, both plant and animal,
25 and potential replacement crops, and processing, biological,

1 chemical, physical, pharmacological, toxicological, and tech-
2 nological investigation thereof, $7,200,000.

3 BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL
4 ENGINEERING

5 Plant, soil, and agricultural engineering research: For
6 expenses necessary for investigations, experiments, and dem-
7 onstrations concerning plants, soils, and agricultural engi-
8 neering, including those related to the production, improve-
9 ment, handling, processing, transportation, and storage of
10 farm and other crops; control of weeds, plant diseases, and
11 nematodes; discovery and introduction of new and useful
12 plants, both foreign and native; soil and water management
13 to improve soil productivity; the relation of soils to plant,
14 animal, and human nutrition; classification and mapping of
15 soils; fertilizers, liming materials, and soil amendments;
16 farm machinery and processing equipment; farm buildings,
17 and farm electrification; and for the operation and mainte-
18 nance of airplanes; $10,351,400.

19 National Arboretum: For the maintenance and develop-
20 ment of the National Arboretum established under the pro-
21 visions of the Act approved March 4, 1927 (20 U. S. C.
22 191–194), $148,600.

1 BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

2 Salaries and Expenses

3 For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments,
4 demonstrations, and surveys for the promotion of economic
5 entomology, for investigating and ascertaining the best
6 means of destroying insects and related pests injurious to
7 agriculture, for importing useful and beneficial insects and
8 bacterial, fungal, and other diseases of insects and related
9 pests, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of
10 destroying insects affecting man and animals, and the best
11 ways of utilizing beneficial insects, for carrying into effect
12 the provisions of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20,
13 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), the Honey Bee
14 Act (7 U. S. C. 281–283), the Insect Pest Act (7 U. S. C.
15 141–144), the Mexican Border Act (7 U. S. C. 149), and
16 the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), as amended,
17 authorizing the eradication, control, and prevention of spread
18 of injurious insects and plant pests; including the operation
19 and maintenance of airplanes and the purchase of not to
20 exceed two, as follows:

21 Insect investigations: For the investigation of insects
22 affecting fruits, grapes, nuts, trees, shrubs, forests and forest

1 products, truck and garden crops, cereal, forage and range
2 crops, cotton, tobacco, sugar plants, ornamental and other
3 plants and agricultural products, household possessions, and
4 man and animals; for bee culture and apiary management;
5 for classifying, identifying, and collecting information to de-
6 termine the distribution and abundance of insects; for inves-
7 tigations in connection with introduction of natural enemies
8 of injurious insects and related pests and for the exchange
9 with other countries of useful and beneficial insects and other
10 arthropods; for developing methods, equipment, and appa-
11 ratus to aid in enforcing plant quarantines and in the eradica-
12 tion and control of insect pests and plant diseases; and for
13 investigations of insecticides and fungicides, including meth-
14 ods of their manufacture and use and the effects of their
15 application, $3,525,000: *Provided,* That of the amount
16 allotted for oriental fruitfly, not to exceed $250,000 may
17 be used for contracts with public or private agencies for
18 research in accordance with section 10 (a) of the Act of
19 August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427i), and the amounts
20 obligated for contract research shall remain available until
21 expended.

22 Insect and plant-disease control: For carrying out
23 operations or measures to eradicate, suppress, control, or to
24 prevent or retard the spread of Japanese beetle, sweetpotato
25 weevil, Mexican fruitflies, phony peach and peach mosaic,

1 cereal rusts, pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil, golden
2 nematode, citrus blackfly, white-fringed beetle, Hall scale,
3 and gypsy and brown-tail moths, including the enforce-
4 ment of quarantine regulations and cooperation with States
5 to enforce plant quarantines as authorized by the Plant
6 Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7
7 U. S. C. 151–167), and including the establishment of
8 such cotton-free areas as may be necessary to stamp out
9 any infestation of the pink bollworm as authorized by the
10 Act of February 8, 1930 (46 Stat. 67), and for cooperation
11 with States in the compensation of growers for losses result-
12 ing from the destruction of or for not planting potatoes and
13 tomatoes on lands infested or exposed to infestations of the
14 golden nematode for the purpose authorized by the Golden
15 Nematode Act (Public Law 645, approved June 15, 1948),
16 $4,500,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropria-
17 tion shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees, farm
18 animals, farm crops, or other property injured or destroyed,
19 except potatoes and tomatoes as authorized under the
20 Golden Nematode Act: *Provided further,* That, in
21 the discretion of the Secretary, no part of this appro-
22 priation shall be expended for the control of sweet-
23 potato weevil in any State until such State has provided
24 cooperation necessary to accomplish this purpose, or for
25 barberry eradication until a sum or sums at least equal to

1 such expenditures shall have been appropriated, subscribed,
2 or contributed by States, counties, or local authorities, or
3 by individuals or organizations for the accomplishment of
4 this purpose, or with respect to the golden nematode except
5 as prescribed in section 4 of the Golden Nematode Act.

6 Plant quarantines: For operations against the in-
7 troduction of insect pests or plant diseases into the
8 United States, including the enforcement of foreign-
9 plant quarantines and regulations promulgated under sections
10 5 and 7 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912,
11 as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), the Insect Pest Act of
12 1905 (7 U. S. C. 141–144), and the Mexican Border Act
13 of 1942 (7 U. S. C. 149), for enforcement of domestic-
14 plant quarantines as they pertain to Territories and districts
15 of the United States, for the enforcement of plant quarantines
16 through inspection in transit, including the interception and
17 disposition of materials found to have been transported in
18 violation of Federal plant quarantine laws or regulations, and
19 operations under the Terminal Inspection Act (7 U. S. C.
20 166) and enforcement of regulations governing the move-
21 ment of plants into and from the District of Columbia
22 promulgated under section 15 of the Plant Quarantine Act
23 of August 20, 1912, as amended, and for inspection and
24 certification of plants and plant products to meet the sani-
25 tary requirements of foreign countries, as authorized in sec-

1 tion 102 of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a),
2 $2,600,000.

3 Control of Emergency Outbreaks of Insects and Plant
4 Diseases

5 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
6 the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C.
7 148–148e), including the operation and maintenance of air-
8 planes and the purchase of not to exceed two, and surveys
9 and control operations in Canada in cooperation with the
10 Canadian Government or local Canadian authorities, and
11 the employment of Canadian citizens, $1,800,000, of which
12 $1,000,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section
13 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, for the purposes
14 of said joint resolution only to the extent that the Secretary,
15 with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds neces-
16 sary to meet emergency conditions.

17 Control of Forest Pests

18 For expenses necessary for carrying out operations,
19 measures, or surveys necessary to eradicate, suppress, con-
20 trol, or to prevent or retard the spread of insects or diseases
21 which endanger forest trees on any lands in the United
22 States, and for such quarantine measures relating thereto
23 as may be necessary pursuant to the Plant Quarantine Act
24 of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167),

1 including the purchase (not to exceed two) and operation
2 and maintenance of airplanes, and construction and alteration
3 of necessary buildings: *Provided,* That the cost of construct-
4 ing or altering any one building during the fiscal year shall
5 not exceed $2,500, as follows:

6 Forest Pest Control Act: For carrying out the provi-
7 sions of the Act approved June 25, 1947 (16 U. S. C.,
8 Supp. I, 594-1—594-5), $1,700,000, of which $500,000
9 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the
10 Revised Statutes, as amended, for the purposes of said Act
11 only to the extent that the Secretary, with the approval of
12 the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency
13 conditions.

14 White pine blister rust: White pine blister rust, pur-
15 suant to the Act of April 26, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 594a),
16 $3,300,000, of which $505,000 shall be available to the
17 Department of the Interior for the control of white pine
18 blister rust on or endangering Federal lands under the
19 jurisdiction of that Department or lands of Indian tribes
20 which are under the jurisdiction of or retained under re-
21 strictions of the United States; $1,750,000 to the Forest
22 Service for the control of white pine blister rust on or endan-
23 gering lands under its jurisdiction; and $1,045,000 to the
24 Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine for leadership
25 and general coordination of the entire program, method de-

1 velopment, and for operations conducted under its direction
2 for such control, including, but not confined to, the control of
3 white pine blister rust on or endangering State and privately
4 owned lands.

5 FOREST SERVICE

6 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

7 For expenses necessary, including not to exceed $10,000
8 for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section
9 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as
10 amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
11 (5 U. S. C. 55a); to experiment and make investigations
12 and report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and lum-
13 bering, but no part of this appropriation shall be used for
14 any experiment or test made outside the jurisdiction of the
15 United States; to advise the owners of woodlands as to
16 the proper care of the same; to investigate and test Amer-
17 ican timber and timber trees and their uses, and methods
18 for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek, through
19 investigations and the planting of native and foreign spe-
20 cies, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to erect neces-
21 sary buildings: *Provided,* That the cost of any building pur-
22 chased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost (not
23 to exceed $1,000) of constructing a water-supply or sani-
24 tary system and of connecting the same with any such
25 building, and exclusive of the cost of any tower upon which

1 a lookout house may be erected, shall not exceed $15,000,
2 with the exception that any building erected, purchased,
3 or acquired, the cost of which was $15,000 or more, may
4 be improved out of the appropriations made under this
5 Act for the Forest Service by an amount not to exceed 2
6 per centum of the cost of such building as certified by the
7 Chief of the Forest Service; to protect, administer, and
8 improve the national forests, including tree planting
9 and other measures to prevent erosion, drift, surface
10 wash, soil waste, and the formation of floods, and to con-
11 serve water; to ascertain the natural conditions upon and
12 utilize the national forests, to transport and care for fish
13 and game supplied to stock the national forests or the waters
14 therein; to collate, digest, report, and illustrate the results
15 of experiments and investigations made by the Forest Serv-
16 ice, as follows:
17 National forest protection and management: For the
18 administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement,
19 and development of the national forests, including the estab-
20 lishment and maintenance of forest tree nurseries, includ-
21 ing the procurement of tree seed and nursery stock by
22 purchase, production, or otherwise, seeding and tree plant-
23 ing and the care of plantations and young growth; the
24 operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of
25 not to exceed three; the maintenance of roads and trails

1 and the construction and maintenance of all other improve-
2 ments necessary for the proper and economical adminis-
3 tration, protection, development, and use of the national
4 forests, including experimental areas under Forest Service
5 administration, except that where direct purchases will be
6 more economical than construction, improvements may be
7 purchased; the construction (not to exceed $15,000 for
8 any one structure), equipment, and maintenance of sani-
9 tary and recreational facilities; timber cultural operations;
10 development and application of fish and game management
11 plans; propagation and transplanting of plants suitable for
12 planting on semiarid portions of the national forests; esti-
13 mating and appraising of timber and other resources and
14 development and application of plans for their effective
15 management, sale, and use; expenses of the National Forest
16 Reservation Commission as authorized by section 14 of the
17 Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 514); examination,
18 classification, surveying, and appraisal of land incident to
19 effecting exchanges authorized by law and of lands within
20 the boundaries of the national forests that may be opened
21 to homestead settlement and entry under the Act of June 11,
22 1906, and the Act of August 10, 1912 (16 U. S. C. 506–
23 509), as provided by the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C.
24 512); investigation and establishment of water rights, in-
25 cluding the purchase thereof or of lands or interests in lands

1 or rights-of-way for use and protection of water rights neces-
2 sary or beneficial in connection with the administration and
3 public use of the national forests; and all expenses necessary
4 for the use, maintenance, improvement, protection, and gen-
5 eral administration of the national forests, $27,122,025, of
6 which not to exceed $75,000 shall be available for the
7 purchase of three nursery sites.

8 Fighting forest fires: For fighting and preventing forest
9 fires on or threatening lands under Forest Service adminis-
10 tration, including lands under contract for purchase or in
11 process of condemnation for Forest Service purposes, and
12 for liquidation of obligations incurred in the preceding fiscal
13 year for such purpose, $6,000,000, of which $2,500,000
14 shall be apportioned for use, pursuant to section 3679 of the
15 Revised Statutes, as amended, only to the extent that the
16 Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget,
17 finds necessary to meet emergency conditions.

18 Forest research: For forest research at forest or range
19 experiment stations, the Forest Products Laboratory, or else-
20 where, in accordance with the provisions of sections 1, 2,
21 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the Act approved May 22, 1928, as
22 amended (16 U. S. C. 581, 581a, 581f–581i), including
23 the construction and maintenance of improvements; fire,
24 silvicultural, watershed, and other forest investigations and
25 experiments; investigations and experiments to develop im-

1 proved methods of management of forest and other ranges;
2 experiments, investigations, and tests of forest products; a
3 comprehensive forest survey; and investigations in forest
4 economics; $5,220,500: *Provided,* That hereafter funds may
5 be received from any State, other political subdivision, organ-
6 ization, or individual for the purpose of establishing or
7 operating any forest research facility located within the
8 United States, its Territories, or possessions.

9 FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

10 For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions
11 of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act approved No-
12 vember 9, 1921, as amended (23 U. S. C. 23, 23a), re-
13 lating to forest development roads and trails, including the
14 construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of roads and
15 trails on experimental areas under Forest Service ad-
16 ministration, $11,500,000, which sum is authorized to
17 be appropriated by the Acts of June 29, 1948 (Public
18 Law 834), and September 7, 1950 (Public Law 769),
19 to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That
20 this appropriation shall be available for the rental, purchase,
21 construction, or alteration of buildings necessary for the
22 storage and repair of equipment and supplies used for road
23 and trail construction and maintenance, but the total cost
24 of any such building purchased, altered, or constructed under
25 this authorization shall not exceed $15,000 with the excep-

1 tion that any building erected, purchased, or acquired, the
2 cost of which was $15,000 or more, may be improved
3 within any fiscal year by an amount not to exceed 2 per
4 centum of the cost of such buildings certified by the Chief of
5 the Forest Service.

6 ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

7 Weeks Act

8 For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions
9 of the Act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16
10 U. S. C. 513–519, 521), $50,000, to be available
11 only for payment toward the purchase price of any
12 lands acquired, including the cost of surveys in con-
13 nection with such acquisition: *Provided,* That no part of
14 such funds shall be used for the purchase of lands in the
15 counties of Adair, Cherokee, and Sequoyah, in the State
16 of Oklahoma, without the specific approval of the Board
17 of County Commissioners of the county in which such lands
18 are situated.

19 Superior National Forest

20 For the acquisition of forest land within the Superior
21 National Forest, Minnesota, under the provisions of the
22 Act approved June 22, 1948 (Public Law 733), $100,000,
23 to remain available until expended.

24 Special Acts

25 For the acquisition of land to facilitate the control of

1 soil erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior
2 boundaries of the following national forests, in accordance
3 with the provisions of the following Acts authorizing annual
4 appropriations of forest receipts for such purposes, and in
5 not to exceed the following amounts from such receipts:
6 Uinta and Wasatch National Forests, Utah, Act of August
7 26, 1935 (Public Law 337), as amended, $40,000; Cache
8 National Forest, Utah, Act of May 11, 1938 (Public
9 Law 505), as amended, $10,000; San Bernardino and
10 Cleveland National Forests, Riverside County, California,
11 Act of June 15, 1938 (Public Law 634), as amended,
12 $22,000; Nevada and Toiyabe National Forests, Nevada,
13 Act of June 25, 1938 (Public Law 748), as amended,
14 $10,000; Angeles National Forest, California, Act of June
15 11, 1940 (Public Law 591), $20,000; Cleveland National
16 Forest, San Diego County, California, Act of June 11, 1940
17 (Public Law 589), $5,000; Sequoia National Forest,
18 California, Act of June 17, 1940 (Public Law 637),
19 $35,000; in all $142,000.

20 STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

21 For expenses necessary for cooperation with the various
22 States in forest-fire prevention and suppression, in forest
23 tree planting, in forest management and processing, and in
24 farm forestry extension, pursuant to the Act of August 25,

1950 (Public Law 729), and sections 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the Act of June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 564–568a), and Acts supplementary thereto; advising timberland owners, associations, and other appropriate agencies in the application of forest management principles to federally owned lands leased to States and to private forest lands, and advising wood-using industries in processing of forest products, so as to attain sustained-yield management, the conservation of the timber resources, the productivity of forest lands, and the stabilization of employment and economic continuance of forest industries; $10,750,000.

FLOOD CONTROL

For expenses necessary, in accordance with the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law 738), as amended and supplemented, to make preliminary examinations and surveys, and to perform works of improvement, and to plan the agricultural phases of the development of the Columbia Basin area, the Arkansas-White-Red River area, and the New England-New York area, in accordance with the provisions of laws relating to the activities of the Department, including not to exceed $100,000 for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a)

1 of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by
2 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a),
3 to remain available until expended, $6,112,800, with
4 which shall be merged the unexpended balances of funds
5 heretofore appropriated or transferred to the Department for
6 flood-control purposes: *Provided,* That no part of such funds
7 shall be used for the purchase of lands in the Yazoo and
8 Little Tallahatchie watersheds without specific approval of
9 the county board of supervisors of the county in which such
10 lands are situated, nor shall any part of such funds be used
11 for the purchase of lands in the counties of Adair, Cherokee,
12 and Sequoyah, in the State of Oklahoma, without the specific
13 approval of the Board of County Commissioners of the
14 county in which such lands are situated: *Provided fur-*
15 *ther,* That of the funds available herein, not in excess of
16 $6,000,000 (with which shall be merged the unexpended
17 balance of funds heretofore made available for these pur-
18 poses) may be expended in watersheds heretofore author-
19 ized by section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December
20 22, 1944, for necessary gully control, floodwater detention,
21 and floodway structures in areas other than those over
22 which the Department of the Army has jurisdiction and
23 responsibility.

1 SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For necessary expenses for carrying out the provisions
4 of the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f),
5 title III of the Act of July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010–
6 1012), and the Act of August 11, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 1011
7 note), including research and investigations into the charac-
8 ter, cause, extent, history, and effects of erosion, soil and
9 moisture depletion, and methods of soil and water conserva-
10 tion (including the construction and hydrologic phases of
11 farm irrigation and land drainage, and the construction,
12 operation, and maintenance of experimental watersheds,
13 stations, laboratories, plots, and installations and water regu-
14 lation to conserve the soil and reduce fire hazards in the
15 Everglades region of Florida, except that expenditures for
16 all work in the Everglades region shall be limited to a sum
17 not in excess of funds made available for such work by the
18 State of Florida, or political subdivisions thereof); making
19 conservation surveys and plans and establishing measures to
20 conserve soil and water (including farm irrigation and land
21 drainage and such special measures as may be necessary
22 to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs); establish-

1 ment and operation of conservation nurseries; development
2 and management of land utilization project lands and facili-
3 ties; dissemination of information; purchase and erection
4 or alteration of permanent buildings; operation and mainte-
5 nance of aircraft; and furnishing of subsistence to employees;
6 $54,278,000: *Provided,* That the cost of any permanent
7 building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of
8 the cost of constructing a water supply or sanitary system
9 and connecting the same to any such building and with the
10 exception of buildings acquired in conjunction with land
11 being purchased for other purposes, shall not exceed $2,500,
12 except for eight buildings to be constructed or improved at a
13 cost not to exceed $15,000 per building and except that
14 alterations or improvements to other existing permanent
15 buildings costing $2,500 or more may be made in any fiscal
16 year in an amount not to exceed $500 per building: *Provided*
17 *further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be available
18 for the construction of any such building on land not owned
19 by the Government: *Provided further,* That in the State of
20 Missouri, where the State has established a central State
21 agency authorized to enter into agreements with the United
22 States or any of its agencies on policies and general pro-

1 grams for the saving of its soil by the extension of Federal
2 aid to any soil conservation district in such State, the agree-
3 ments made by or on behalf of the United States with any
4 such soil conservation district shall have the prior approval
5 of such central State agency before they shall become effective
6 as to such district: *Provided further,* That no part of this
7 appropriation may be expended for soil and water conserva-
8 tion operations under the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C.
9 590a–590f), in demonstration projects: *Provided further,*
10 That not to exceed $5,000 may be used for employment pur-
11 suant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic
12 Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15
13 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided*
14 *further,* That not to exceed $265,000 of funds authorized
15 for fiscal year 1951 for development of land utilization proj-
16 ects may remain available until expended: *Provided further,*
17 That qualified local engineers may be temporarily employed
18 at per diem rates to perform the technical planning work of
19 the service.

20 WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

21 For expenses necessary to carry into effect the functions
22 of the Department under the Acts of May 10, 1939 (53 Stat.

1 685, 719), October 14, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 590y–z–10), as
2 amended and supplemented, June 28, 1949 (Public Law
3 132), and September 6, 1950 (Public Law 760), relating
4 to water conservation and utilization projects, to remain
5 available until expended, $185,500, which sum shall be
6 merged with the unexpended balances of funds heretofore
7 appropriated or transferred to said Department for the
8 purposes of said Act.

9 PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

10 CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND

11 RESOURCES

12 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the pro-
13 visions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation
14 and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936,
15 as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q), including not to
16 exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits,
17 including such displays at State, interstate, and international
18 fairs within the United States; $256,500,000, to remain
19 available until December 31 of the next succeeding fiscal
20 year for compliance with the program of soil-building prac-
21 tices and soil- and water-conserving practices authorized
22 under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appro-

1 priation Act, 1951, carried out during the period July 1,
2 1950, to December 31, 1951, inclusive: *Provided,* That not
3 to exceed $25,250,000 of the total sum provided under
4 this head shall be available during the current fiscal year
5 for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying
6 out such program, the cost of aerial photographs, however,
7 not to be charged to such limitation; but not more than
8 $4,966,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account,
9 "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjust-
10 ment Act of 1938": *Provided further,* That payments to
11 claimants hereunder may be made upon the certificate of
12 the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the
13 Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the con-
14 servation practice or practices and has complied with all
15 other requirements as conditions for such payments and that
16 the statements and information contained in the application
17 for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge
18 and belief, under the penalties of title 18, United States Code:
19 *Provided further,* That none of the funds herein appropriated
20 or made available for the functions assigned to the Agri-
21 cultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order
22 Numbered 9069, of February 23, 1942, shall be used to
23 pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information

1 employees or any State information employees, but this shall
2 not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of in-
3 formation at the county level to individual farmers: *Provided*
4 *further,* That such amount shall be available for salaries and
5 other administrative expenses in connection with the formu-
6 lation and administration of the 1952 program of soil-
7 building practices and soil- and water-conserving practices,
8 under the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended (amount-
9 ing to $225,000,000, including administration, and formu-
10 lated on the basis of a distribution of the funds available for
11 payments and grants among the several States in accordance
12 with their conservation needs as determined by the Secre-
13 tary, except that the proportion allocated to any State shall
14 not be reduced more than 15 per centum from the
15 distribution for the next preceding program year, and no
16 participant shall receive more than $2,500) ; but the pay-
17 ments or grants under such programs shall be conditioned
18 upon the utilization of land with respect to which such pay-
19 ments or grants are to be made in conformity with farming
20 practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building
21 and soil- and water-conserving practices in the most practical
22 and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several
23 States, as determined and approved by the State committees
24 appointed pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation

1 and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590h
2 (b)), for the respective States: *Provided further,* That not
3 to exceed 5 per centum of the allocation for the agricultural
4 conservation program for any county may be allotted with
5 the approval of the State committee to the Soil Conservation
6 Service for services of its technicians in formulating and
7 carrying out the agricultural conservation program and the
8 funds so allotted shall not be utilized by the Soil Conserva-
9 tion Service for any purpose other than technical and other
10 assistance in such county: *Provided further,* That such
11 amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, ferti-
12 lizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any
13 soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agri-
14 cultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming
15 practices approved by the Secretary under programs provided
16 for herein: *Provided further,* That no part of any funds
17 available to the Department, or any bureau, office, cor-
18 poration, or other agency constituting a part of such Depart-
19 ment, shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment
20 of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been
21 convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent
22 pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as
23 amended, or who has been found in accordance with the
24 provisions of title 18, United States Code, section 1913, to
25 have violated or attempted to violate such section which

1 prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the pay-
2 ment of personal services or other expenses designed to influ-
3 ence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose
4 any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon
5 request of any Member or through the proper official
6 channels.

7 AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION PROGRAMS

8 To enable the Secretary to formulate and carry out acre-
9 age allotment and marketing quota programs pursuant to
10 provisions of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act
11 of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1301–1393), including
12 the measurement of the acreage planted to cotton on the
13 farms whether or not marketing quotas are in effect, provid-
14 ing that not more than $1,000,000 shall be available for
15 this purpose, and to provide assistance in obtaining equip-
16 ment, materials, and facilities necessary to attain needed
17 production of agricultural commodities, $8,300,000, of which
18 not more than $2,000,000 shall be transferred to the appro-
19 priation account "Administrative expenses, section 392,
20 Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938".

21 SUGAR ACT PROGRAM

22 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the pro-
23 visions of the Sugar Act of 1948 (7 U. S. C. 1101–1160),
24 $70,000,000, to remain available until June 30 of the next
25 succeeding fiscal year: *Provided,* That expenditures (includ-

1 ing transfers) from this appropriation for other than pay-
2 ments to sugar producers shall not exceed $1,500,000.

3 NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

4 To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of
5 the National School Lunch Act (42 U. S. C. 1751–1760),
6 $83,500,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation
7 shall be used for nonfood assistance under section 5 of said
8 Act.

9 MARKETING SERVICES

10 For expenses necessary for acquiring and diffusing
11 market information on agricultural commodities, food prod-
12 ucts and by-products, the standardization, classification,
13 grading, handling, storage and marketing thereof, including
14 the demonstration and promotion of the use of uniform stand-
15 ards of classification of American farm and food products
16 throughout the world, the analysis of cotton fiber, the classing
17 of cotton for producer members of cotton quality improve-
18 ment groups, the establishment of classification standards and
19 maintenance of an inspection service for tobacco (7. U. S. C.
20 471–476, 501–508, 511–511q); for investigating and certi-
21 fying, in one or more jurisdictions, to shippers and other
22 interested parties the class, quality, and condition of any
23 agricultural commodity or food product, whether raw or
24 processed, and any product containing an agricultural com-
25 modity or derivative thereof when offered for interstate ship-

1 ment or when received at such important central markets as
2 the Secretary may from time to time designate, or at points
3 which may be conveniently reached therefrom under such
4 rules and regulations as he may prescribe, including the
5 collection of such fees as are reasonable and as nearly as may
6 cover the cost of the service rendered; for performing the
7 duties imposed upon the Secretary by chapter 14 of the
8 Internal Revenue Code relating to cotton futures (26
9 U. S. C. 1920–1935); and for carrying into effect the
10 United States Cotton Standards Act (7 U. S. C. 51–65),
11 the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U. S. C. 71–87),
12 the Naval Stores Act (7 U. S. C. 91–99), section 201 (a)
13 to 201 (d), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjust-
14 ment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1291), including not to
15 exceed $25,000 for employment at rates not to exceed $100
16 per diem, pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a),
17 of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended
18 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a),
19 the Acts to provide standards for containers for fruits and
20 vegetables (15 U. S. C. 251–257i), the United States Ware-
21 house Act (7 U. S. C. 241–273), the Federal Seed Act
22 (7 U. S. C. 1551–1610), the Packers and Stockyards Act
23 (7 U. S. C. 181–229), the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide,
24 and Rodenticide Act (7 U. S. C. 135–135k), and the
25 Tobacco Plant and Seed Exportation Act (7 U. S. C. 516),

1 $10,800,000: *Provided,* That hereafter appropriations avail-
2 able for classing or grading any agricultural commodity with-
3 out charge to the producers thereof may be reimbursed from
4 nonadministrative funds of the Commodity Credit Corpora-
5 tion for the cost of classing or grading any such commodity
6 for producers who are eligible to obtain Commodity Credit
7 Corporation price support.

8 COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

9 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provi-
10 sions of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7
11 U. S. C. 1–17a), $650,000.

12 FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

13 For operating and administrative expenses, $8,000,000.

14 RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

15 To carry into effect the provisions of the Rural Elec-
16 trification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–924),
17 as follows:

18 LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS

19 For loans in accordance with said Act, and for carry-
20 ing out the provisions of section 7 thereof, to be borrowed
21 from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the
22 provisions of section 3 (a) of said Act as follows: Rural
23 electrification program, $100,000,000; and rural telephone
24 program, $9,000,000; and additional amounts, not to ex-
25 ceed a total of $100,000,000, may be borrowed for the rural

1 electrification program under the same terms and conditions
2 to the extent that such additional amounts are required dur-
3 ing the fiscal year 1952, under the then existing conditions,
4 for the expeditious and orderly development of the program.

5 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

6 For administrative expenses, including not to exceed
7 $500 for financial and credit reports, and not to exceed
8 $150,000 for employment pursuant to the second sentence
9 of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C.
10 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
11 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), $7,750,000.

12 FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

13 To carry into effect the provisions of titles I, II, and
14 the related provisions of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones
15 Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1000–1031),
16 the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946 (7 U. S. C.
17 1001, note; 31 U. S. C. 82h; 12 U. S. C. 371; 35 D. C.
18 Code 535; 60 Stat. 1062–1080); the Act of July 30, 1946
19 (40 U. S. C. 436–439); the Act of August 28, 1937, as
20 amended (16 U. S. C. 590r–590x, 590z–5), for the devel-
21 opment of facilities for water storage and utilization in the
22 arid and semiarid areas of the United States; the
23 provisions of title V of the Housing Act of 1949 relating
24 to financial assistance for farm housing (42 U. S. C. 1471–
25 1483); the Rural Rehabilitation Corporation Trust Liquida-

1 tion Act, approved May 3, 1950 (Public Law 499); and
2 the Act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey
3 certain mineral interests, approved September 6, 1950
4 (Public Law 760), as follows:

5 LOAN AUTHORIZATION

6 For loans (including payments in lieu of taxes and
7 taxes under section 50 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant
8 Act, as amended, and advances incident to the acquisition
9 and preservation of security of obligations under the fore-
10 going several authorities): Title I and section 43 of title IV
11 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and
12 title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (except grants under
13 504 (a)) $38,000,000, of which not to exceed $5,000,000
14 of the amount available for the purposes of title I and sec-
15 tion 43 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as
16 amended, may be distributed to States and Territories with-
17 out regard to farm population and prevalence of tenancy,
18 in addition to the amount otherwise distributed thereto, for
19 loans in reclamation projects and to entrymen on unpatented
20 public land (sums available for loans under title V of the
21 Housing Act of 1949 to remain available until expended);
22 title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as
23 amended, $100,000,000; the Act of August 28, 1937, as
24 amended, $4,250,000: *Provided,* That not to exceed the

1 foregoing several amounts shall be borrowed in one account
2 from the Secretary of the Treasury, and, hereafter, such
3 sums annually for the purposes of this paragraph as the
4 Congress may determine by provision in appropriation
5 acts, on the request of the Secretary of Agriculture, at
6 such rate of interest as may be determined by the Secre-
7 tary of the Treasury, but not in excess of 3 per centum
8 per annum; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby
9 authorized and directed to lend such sums to the Secretary
10 upon the security of any obligations of borrowers from
11 the Secretary under the provisions of said Acts: *Provided*
12 *further*, That the Secretary may utilize proceeds from
13 payments of principal and interest under such Acts to
14 repay the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts borrowed
15 therefrom for the purposes of such Acts: *Provided further*,
16 That for the purpose of making loans pursuant to the fore-
17 going authority, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized
18 to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the
19 sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond
20 Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may
21 be issued under that Act are extended to include such loans
22 to the Secretary: *Provided further*, That repayments to the
23 Secretary of the Treasury on such loans shall be treated as a
24 public-debt transaction.

1 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

2 For the making, servicing, and collecting of loans and
3 insured mortgages, the servicing and collecting of loans made
4 under prior authority, the liquidation of assets transferred
5 to Farmers' Home Administration pursuant to the Farmers'
6 Home Administration Act of 1946, the extension of financial
7 assistance under the Housing Act of 1949, and the adminis-
8 tration of assets transferred under subsection 2 (f) of the
9 Act of May 3, 1950, $27,500,000, together with a transfer
10 to this appropriation item of not to exceed $230,000 of the
11 fees and administrative expense charges made available by
12 subsections (d) and (e) of section 12 of the Bankhead-
13 Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended.

14 FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

15 For necessary expenses, including library membership
16 fees or dues in organizations which issue publications to
17 members only or to members at a lower price than to others,
18 payment for which may be made in advance; not to exceed
19 $20,000 for expenditures authorized by section 602 of the
20 Organic Act of 1944 (12 U. S. C. 833); $300,000, to-
21 gether with not to exceed $2,325,000 of receipts from Farm
22 Credit agencies, to be advanced to this appropriation, to cover
23 the cost of supervision, facilities, examinations, and other
24 services rendered to such agencies; $2,625,000.

1 EXTENSION SERVICE

2 PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, ALASKA, AND PUERTO RICO

3 For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto
4 Rico, for cooperative agricultural extension work as follows:
5 Capper-Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts:
6 Capper-Ketcham Act, the Act approved May 22, 1928 (7
7 U. S. C. 343a, 343b), $1,480,000; Bankhead-Jones Act,
8 section 21, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7
9 U. S. C. 343c), $12,000,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, sec-
10 tion 23, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935, as
11 amended by the Act of June 6, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 343d–1),
12 $12,500,000; additional extension work, the Act approved
13 April 24, 1939, as amended (7 U. S. C. 343c–1), $555,000;
14 Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C.
15 386c), extending the benefits of the Smith-Lever Act to the
16 Territory of Alaska, $13,950, and the Act approved Octo-
17 ber 27, 1949 (7 U. S. C. 343d–4, 5), extending to
18 the Territory of Alaska the benefits of the Capper-
19 Ketcham Act and sections 21 and 23 of title II of
20 the Bankhead-Jones Act, $42,150; Puerto Rico, section 3
21 of the Act of March 4, 1931 (7 U. S. C. 386f), author-
22 izing extension of the Capper-Ketcham Act to Puerto Rico,
23 $31,348; the Act approved August 28, 1937 (7 U. S. C.
24 343f–343g), extending the benefits of section 21 of the

1 Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, $408,000, and the Act
2 approved October 26, 1949 (7 U. S. C. 343d–2, 3), ex-
3 tending the benefits of section 23 of title II of the Bank-
4 head-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, $71,502; and section 506a
5 of title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U. S. C. 1476),
6 $33,050; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and
7 Puerto Rico, $27,135,000.

8 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9 For expenses necessary to administer the provisions of
10 the Smith-Lever Act, approved May 8, 1914 (7 U. S. C.
11 341–348), and Acts amendatory or supplementary thereto,
12 and to coordinate the extension work of the Department and
13 the several States, Territories, and insular possessions,
14 $880,000.

15 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

16 For expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agricul-
17 ture, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle
18 for replacement only; travel expenses, including examina-
19 tion of estimates for appropriations in the field; stationery,
20 supplies, materials, and equipment; freight, express, and
21 drayage charges; advertising of bids, communication service,
22 postage, washing towels, repairs and alterations, and other
23 miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided
24 for and necessary for the practical and efficient work
25 of the Department of Agriculture, $2,082,200, together

1 with such amounts from other appropriations or author-
2 izations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget
3 for the current fiscal year for such services and expenses,
4 which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be de-
5 termined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $109,280,
6 shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation:
7 *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appro-
8 priations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall
9 at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated,
10 respectively, therefor in the budget for such year, the
11 amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this
12 appropriation shall be increased or decreased in such amounts
13 as the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with
14 representatives of the Department, shall determine are ap-
15 propriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions
16 or increases in such appropriations or authorizations.

17 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

18 For necessary expenses, including payment of fees or
19 dues for the use of law libraries by attorneys in the field
20 service, $2,200,000, together with such amounts from other
21 appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the
22 schedules in the budget for the current fiscal year for such
23 expenses which several amounts not exceeding a total of
24 $207,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of this
25 appropriation.

1 OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

2 For necessary expenses for the Office of Foreign Agri-
3 cultural Relations and for enabling the Secretary to coordi-
4 nate and integrate activities of the Department in connec-
5 tion with foreign agricultural work, including the purchase
6 of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only,
7 $600,000.

8 OFFICE OF INFORMATION

9 For necessary expenses in connection with the publica-
10 tion, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins, docu-
11 ments, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and dis-
12 play of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and exhibits,
13 and the coordination of informational work and programs
14 authorized by Congress in the Department, $1,271,000,
15 together with such amounts from other appropriations or
16 authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the
17 Budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses, which
18 several amounts not exceeding a total of $16,200, shall be
19 transferred to and made a part of this appropriation,
20 of which total appropriation amounts not exceeding those
21 specified may be used for the purposes enumerated as fol-
22 lows: For preparation and display of exhibits, $104,725;
23 for preparation, distribution, and display of motion and
24 sound pictures, $75,600; for farmers' bulletins, which
25 shall be adapted to the interests of the people of the

1 different sections of the country, an equal proportion
2 of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or sent out under
3 the addressed franks furnished by the Senators, Representa-
4 tives, and Delegates in Congress, as they shall direct (7
5 U. S. C. 417) and not less than two hundred thirty thousand
6 eight hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Senate and
7 House of Representatives of part 2 of the annual report of
8 the Secretary (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture),
9 as authorized by section 73 of the Act of January 12, 1895
10 (44 U. S. C. 241), $611,128: *Provided,* That additional
11 funds for preparation and display of agricultural motion
12 pictures and exhibits relating to the programs of the various
13 agencies of the Department authorized by Congress, not
14 exceeding $150,000, may be transferred to and made a
15 part of this appropriation, from the funds applicable, and
16 shall be available for the objects specified herein: *Provided*
17 *further,* That in the preparation of motion pictures or exhibits
18 by the Department, not exceeding a total of $10,000 may
19 be used for employment pursuant to the second sentence of
20 section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C.
21 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
22 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further,* That no part
23 of this appropriation shall be used for the establishment or
24 maintenance of regional or State field offices, or for the com-
25 pensation of employees in such offices.

1 LIBRARY

2 For necessary expenses, including dues for library
3 membership in societies or associations which issue publica-
4 tions to members only or at a price to members lower than
5 to subscribers who are not members; $700,000.

6 TITLE II—SPECIAL ACTIVITIES

7 RESEARCH ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL AGRICULTURAL
8 MATERIALS

9 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry
10 out his responsibilities under section 7 (b) of the Strategic
11 and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of July 23, 1946
12 (50 U. S. C. 98f), $450,000: *Provided,* That this appro-
13 priation shall be subject to applicable provisions contained
14 in the item "Office of Administrator, Agricultural Research
15 Administration".

16 Eradication of Foot-and-Mouth Disease and Other Contagious
17 Diseases of Animals and Poultry, Agricultural Research
18 Administration

19 For expenses necessary in the arrest and eradication
20 of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuro-
21 pneumonia, or other contagious or infectious diseases of
22 animals, or European fowl pest and similar diseases in poul-
23 try, including the payment of claims growing out of past
24 and future purchases and destruction of animals (including
25 poultry) affected by or exposed to, or of materials con-

1 taminated by or exposed to, any such disease, wherever
2 found and irrespective of ownership, under like or substan-
3 tially similar circumstances, when such owner has complied
4 with all lawful quarantine regulations; and for foot-and-
5 mouth disease and rinderpest programs undertaken pur-
6 suant to the provisions of the Act of February 28, 1947, and
7 the Act of May 29, 1884, as amended (7 U. S. C. 391; 21
8 U. S. C. 111–122), including expenses in accordance with
9 section 2 of said Act of February 28, 1947, the Secretary may
10 transfer from other appropriations or funds available to the
11 bureaus, corporations, or agencies of the Department such
12 sums as he may deem necessary, to be available only in an
13 emergency which threatens the livestock or poultry industry
14 of the country, and any unexpended balances of funds trans-
15 ferred under this head in the next preceding fiscal year shall
16 be merged with such transferred amounts: *Provided,* That,
17 except for payments made pursuant to said Act of Febru-
18 ary 28, 1947, the payment for such animals hereafter pur-
19 chased may be made on appraisement based on the meat,
20 egg-production, dairy, or breeding value, but in case of ap-
21 praisement based on breeding value no appraisement of any
22 such animal shall exceed three times its meat, egg-produc-
23 tion, or dairy value, and, except in case of an extraordinary
24 emergency, to be determined by the Secretary, the pay-
25 ment by the United States Government for any such animals

1 shall not exceed one-half of any such appraisements: *Pro-*
2 *vided further,* That poultry may be appraised in groups
3 when the basis for appraisal is the same for each bird: *Pro-*
4 *vided further,* That this appropriation shall be subject to
5 applicable provisions contained in the item "Office of Ad-
6 ministrator, Agricultural Research Administration": *Pro-*
7 *vided further,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby
8 authorized and directed to discharge indebtedness of the
9 Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the
10 Treasury by canceling notes issued by the Corporation to
11 the Secretary of the Treasury in the amount of $32,700,000
12 for funds transferred and expenses incurred under this head
13 through fiscal year 1950 pursuant to authority granted in the
14 Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1950.

15 TITLE III—CORPORATIONS

16 The following corporations and agencies are hereby au-
17 thorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of
18 funds and borrowing authority available to each such cor-
19 poration or agency and in accord with law, and to make
20 such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal
21 year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Gov-
22 ernment Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be
23 necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in
24 the budget for the fiscal year 1952 for such corporation or
25 agency, except as hereinafter provided:

1 Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

2 Commodity Credit Corporation: Nothing in this Act
3 shall be so construed as to prevent the Commodity Credit
4 Corporation from carrying out any activity or any program
5 authorized by law: *Provided,* That not to exceed $15,000,000
6 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corpo-
7 ration: *Provided further,* That all necessary expenses (in-
8 cluding legal and special services performed on a contract
9 or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in
10 connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance,
11 improvement, or disposition of any real or personal prop-
12 erty belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an
13 interest, including expenses of collections of pledged col-
14 lateral, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses
15 for the purposes hereof: *Provided further,* That the Sec-
16 retary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed
17 to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corpo-
18 ration to the Secretary of the Treasury by canceling notes
19 issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury
20 in the amount of the capital impairment determined by the
21 appraisal of June 30, 1950 (but not to exceed $427,-
22 000,000), pursuant to sections 1 and 4 of the Act of
23 March 8, 1938, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a–1, 4):
24 *Provided further,* That $1,000,000 of this appropriation shall
25 be placed in reserve, to be apportioned for use pursuant to

1 section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, only in
2 such amounts and at such times as may become necessary
3 due to the existence of substantial surpluses of the basic
4 commodities requiring mandatory price support.

5 Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation: Not to exceed
6 $1,100,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the
7 funds of the Corporation shall be available for administrative
8 expenses, including employment on a contract or fee basis of
9 persons, firms, and corporations for the performance of special
10 services, including legal services, and the use of the services
11 and facilities of Federal land banks, national farm loan asso-
12 ciations, Federal Reserve banks, and agencies of the Gov-
13 ernment as authorized by the Act of January 31, 1934
14 (12 U. S. C. 1020–1020h); and said total sum shall be
15 exclusive of services and facilities furnished and examina-
16 tions made by the Farm Credit Administration central
17 office, interest expense, and expenses in connection with
18 the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, pro-
19 tection, or disposition of real or personal property belong-
20 ing to the Corporation or in which it has an interest:
21 *Provided,* That promptly after June 30 of each fiscal year
22 all cash funds in excess of the estimated operating require-
23 ments for the current fiscal year shall be declared as divi-
24 dends and paid into the general fund of the Treasury: *Pro-*
25 *vided further,* That the aggregate amount of bonds the

1 Corporation may issue and have outstanding at any one time
2 shall not exceed $500,000,000.
3 Federal intermediate credit banks: Not to exceed
4 $1,496,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis)
5 of the funds of the banks shall be available for
6 administrative expenses and services performed for the
7 banks by other Government agencies (except services and
8 facilities furnished and examinations made by the Farm
9 Credit Administration central office, and services performed
10 by any Federal Reserve bank and by the United States
11 Treasury in connection with the financial transactions of
12 the banks); and said total sum shall be exclusive of interest
13 expense, legal and special services performed on a contract
14 or fee basis, and expenses in connection with the acquisition,
15 operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or dis-
16 position of real or personal property belonging to the banks
17 or in which they have an interest.
18 Production credit corporations: Not to exceed $1,-
19 358,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the
20 funds of the corporations shall be available for ad-
21 ministrative expenses and services performed for the cor-
22 porations by other Government agencies (except services
23 and facilities furnished and examinations made by the Farm
24 Credit Administration central office); and said total sum
25 shall be exclusive of interest expense, legal and special

1 services performed on a contract or fee basis, and expenses
2 in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance,
3 improvement, protection, or disposition of real or personal
4 property belonging to the corporations or in which they
5 have an interest.

6 TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

7 SEC. 401. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by
8 law, the lump-sum appropriations and authorizations made
9 for the Department under this Act shall be available for
10 the purchase, in addition to those specifically provided for,
11 of not to exceed 497 passenger motor vehicles for
12 replacement only, and for the hire of such vehicles, necessary
13 in the conduct of the work of the Department outside the
14 District of Columbia.

15 SEC. 402. Provisions of law prohibiting or re-
16 stricting the employment of aliens shall not apply to (1)
17 the temporary employment of translators when competent
18 citizen translators are not available; (2) employment in
19 cases of emergency of persons in the field service of the
20 Department for periods of not more than sixty days; and
21 (3) employment under the appropriation for the Office of
22 Foreign Agricultural Relations.

23 SEC. 403. Of appropriations herein made which
24 are available for the purchase of lands, not to exceed $1

1 may be expended for each option to purchase any partic-
2 ular tract or tracts of land.

3 SEC. 404. No part of the funds appropriated
4 by this Act shall be used for the payment of any officer
5 or employee of the Department who, as such officer or
6 employee, or on behalf of the Department or any division,
7 commission, or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued,
8 any prediction, oral or written, or forecast, except as to
9 damage threatened or caused by insects and pests, with
10 respect to future prices of cotton or the trend of same.

11 SEC. 405. Except to provide materials required
12 in or incident to research or experimental work where no
13 suitable domestic product is available, no part of the funds
14 appropriated by this Act shall be expended in the
15 purchase of twine manufactured from commodities or mate-
16 rials produced outside of the United States.

17 SEC. 406. Not less than $575,000 shall be avail-
18 able for contracts in accordance with section 10 (a)
19 of the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427i) from
20 appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Agricultural
21 Economics; Bureau of Animal Industry; Bureau of Dairy
22 Industry; Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural
23 Engineering; Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine;
24 Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry; Bureau of

1 Human Nutrition and Home Economics; and the Forest
2 Service.

3 SEC. 407. No part of the funds made available by this
4 Act may be used to compensate any person for employ-
5 ment in the Federal service outside the continental limits
6 of the United States at a rate higher than is paid for com-
7 parable work in the Federal service within the continental
8 limits of the United States, other than a person who was
9 a resident citizen of the continental United States at the
10 date of his appointment to a position outside the continental
11 limits of the United States and has had continuous employ-
12 ment in the Federal service (except as interrupted by serv-
13 ice in the Armed Forces of the United States) from the
14 date of such appointment.

15 SEC. 408. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law,
16 the Department is hereby authorized hereafter to employ or
17 otherwise contract with persons at regular rates of pay for
18 necessary hours of work for emergency forest fire fighting and
19 pest control and for handling of animals, including dairy
20 cattle, without regard to Sundays, Federal holidays, and
21 the regular workweek.

22 SEC. 409. No part of any appropriation contained in
23 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any cor-
24 poration included in this Act, shall be used to pay the salary
25 or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the

1 Government of the United States or who is a member of an
2 organization of Government employees that asserts the right
3 to strike against the Government of the United States, or who
4 advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates,
5 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by
6 force or violence: *Provided,* That for the purposes hereof an
7 affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the
8 person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions
9 of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of
10 the United States, is not a member of an organization of
11 Government employees that asserts the right to strike against
12 the Government of the United States, or that such person
13 does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization
14 that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the
15 United States by force or violence: *Provided further,* That
16 any person who engages in a strike against the Government
17 of the United States or who is a member of an organization
18 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike
19 against the Government of the United States, or who advo-
20 cates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates,
21 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by
22 force or violence and accepts employment the salary or
23 wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund
24 contained in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon
25 conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned

1 for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further,* That
2 the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in
3 substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Pro-*
4 *vided further,* That nothing in this section shall be construed
5 to require an affidavit from any person employed for less
6 than sixty days for sudden emergency work involving the
7 loss of human life or destruction of property, the payment
8 of salary or wages may be made to such persons from ap-
9 plicable appropriations for services rendered in such emer-
10 gency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by
11 this section.

12 No part of any appropriation contained in this Act or of
13 the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or
14 agency included in this Act shall be used for publicity or
15 propaganda purposes to support or defeat legislation pending
16 before the Congress.

17 SEC. 410. No part of any appropriation or authorization
18 contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensa-
19 tion of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or posi-
20 tion which may become vacant during the fiscal year be-
21 ginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided,* That this inhibition
22 shall not apply—

23 (a) to not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;

24 (b) to positions filled from within the agency;

25 (c) to offices or positions required by law to be

1 filled by appointment of the President by and with the
2 advice and consent of the Senate;
3 (d) to seasonal and casual workers;
4 (e) to meat inspectors;
5 (f) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2;
6 (g) to field employees of the Soil Conservation
7 Service and Production and Marketing Administration
8 who provide conservation assistance to farmers and
9 ranchers.
10 *Provided further,* That when any department or agency
11 covered in this Act has reduced their employment rolls to
12 80 per centum of the total number on their rolls as of July
13 1, 1951, this limitation may cease to apply.
14 SEC. 411. This Act may be cited as the "Department
15 of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1952".

Passed the House of Representatives May 17, 1951.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk.

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

MAY 21 (legislative day, MAY 17), 1951

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 31 (legislative day, MAY 17), 1951

Referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed

AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, viz:

1 On page 59, between lines 13 and 14, insert the
2 following:
3 "SEC. 411. (a) The Director of the Bureau of the
4 Budget is authorized and directed to determine, on the basis
5 of the relative needs of the various departments and inde-
6 pendent establishments or agencies in the executive branch
7 of the Government, the numbers of full-time civilian em-
8 ployees (including full-time intermittent employees who are
9 paid on a 'when actually employed' basis and full-time

1 employees paid nominal compensation such as $1 a year or
2 $1 a month) and the man-months of part-time employment
3 (including part-time employment by intermittent employees
4 who are paid on a 'when actually employed' basis, and part-
5 time employment by employees paid nominal compensation
6 such as $1 a year or $1 a month) required by such depart-
7 ments and agencies for the efficient performance of their
8 authorized functions, so that during the period beginning on
9 July 1, 1951, and ending on March 31, 1952, the aggregate
10 number of full-time civilian employees (including the full-
11 time equivalent of man-months of part-time employment)
12 shall not exceed one million two hundred and fifty thousand
13 in the case of the departments and independent establish-
14 ments or agencies (other than the Department of the Army,
15 the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the
16 Air Force), or one million two hundred and fifty thousand
17 in the case of the Department of the Army, the Department
18 of Navy, and the Department of the Air Force.
19 "(b) The heads of departments and independent estab-
20 lishments or agencies in the executive branch shall present
21 to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget such informa-
22 tion as the Director shall from time to time require for
23 the purpose of making the determinations referred to in
24 subsection (a). Such determinations shall be made from

1 time to time, but at least quarterly. Any personnel in excess
2 of the number determined by the Director to be in excess
3 of the number required by a department or agency shall
4 be released or terminated at such times as the Director shall
5 order. The employment by any department or agency of
6 personnel in excess of the numbers determined by the
7 Director under this section to be required by such department
8 or agency shall be reported to the Congress.

9 "(c) No provision of law authorizing the employment
10 of personnel by, or appropriating funds for the compensa-
11 tion of personnel of, or conferring additional functions upon,
12 any department, establishment, or agency shall be construed
13 to authorize the employment of, or payment of compensation
14 to, a greater number of civilian employees than the number
15 so determined by the Director with respect to such depart-
16 ment, establishment, or agency unless such provision of law
17 specifically authorizes the employment or payment of sal-
18 aries of personnel in excess of such number or exempts such
19 department, establishment, or agency from the provisions of
20 this section.

21 "(d) Determinations by the Director under this section
22 shall be by such appropriation units or organization units as
23 he may deem appropriate.

24 "(e) Casual employees, as defined by the Civil Service

1 Commission, and employees hired without compensation
2 may be excluded from the determinations and reports
3 required by this section."

4 On page 59, line 14, strike out "SEC. 411" and insert
5 in lieu thereof "SEC. 412".

82d CONGRESS
1st SESSION

H. R. 3973

AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

MAY 31 (legislative day, MAY 17), 1951
Referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. SALTONSTALL addressed the Chair.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, before I yield to any other Senator, I should like to make one observation.

There is one thing upon which I think we can all agree, and that is that General Ridgway and General Van Fleet are doing a wonderful job in Korea.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President——

Mr. McFARLAND. I think there is another thing that we can all agree upon, and that is that no one could be doing a better job. I believe that it is for us to think a little more as to how we can strengthen them and help them, rather than to live altogether in the past. I am willing to go into these matters of the past in detail, but I do not think we ought to neglect the future. That is the important thing.

At this time I wish to say that personally I feel that General Ridgway and General Van Fleet should be highly commended for the wonderful job they are doing in Korea.

Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me say to the Senator from Arizona that, of course, I agree that General Ridgway and General Van Fleet are doing a good job now. The basis of the inquiry by the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee was, as I understand, to consider, first, the broad general questions of policy in the future, which must be based upon the experience of the past; and second, the justification and the wisdom of the dismissal of General MacArthur, and the manner in which he was dismissed.

I think we all agree that the President had the right to dismiss him. I think the Joint Chiefs of Staff, when their opinion was asked, concurred. But they did not all agree as to the manner in which General MacArthur was dismissed, even though, in broad terms, they concurred in the wisdom of the dismissal.

I think that needs to be made clear, in answer to the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Wyoming.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not wish to be in the position of farming out time. Several Senators desire to transact routine business. If Senators wish to do so, they may speak on the subject under discussion following the transaction of routine business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, with which all Senators are familiar, the Senator who has the floor can yield only for a question, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes. I do not wish to violate the rule by farming out time. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may transact routine matters for the RECORD, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Chair will enforce the part of the unanimous-consent agreement which provides for routine business to be transacted without debate. Senators who wish to speak formally on any subject must do so in their own time.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF REGISTRATION PROVISIONS OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the administration and enforcement of the registration provisions of the Subversive Activities Control Act, for the period from September 23, 1950, to May 31, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REPORT OF THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Chairman of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of its official proceedings for the year ended December 31, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

U. S. COMMERCIAL COMPANY—AMENDMENT ADOPTED BY RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letter from the Secretary of the Senate, which was read and ordered to lie on the table:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
May 31, 1951.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE:

I am in receipt of a letter from the Secretary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, two certified copies of an amendment adopted on May 21, 1951, to paragraph 9 of the U. S. Commercial Company, which have been placed in the files of the Senate.

Respectfully,

LESLIE L. BIFFLE,
Secretary.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The petition of Earl N. Bathrick, of Saratoga Springs, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation providing assistance to the Institute for Neurological Diseases; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Flushing (N. Y.) Council of Women's Organizations, Inc., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for adequate appropriation for the expansion of personnel to guard all ports of entry, etc., relating to the illegal importation of narcotics (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1565. A bill for the relief of Andy Duzsik; and

S. 1566. A bill for the relief of Constantin Alexander Solomonides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for Mr. MURRAY):

S. 1567. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Ursula Rutherford Ollinger; and

S. 1568. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Mary Rutherford Spearson; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1569. A bill for the relief of Dr. Klaus C. Karde and Ingeborg Karde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1570. A bill to amend the immunity provision relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or their committees; and

S. 1571. A bill to amend chapter 19, title 5, of the United States Code, entitled "Administrative Procedure Act," so as to prohibit the employment by any person of any member, official, attorney, or employee of a Government agency except under certain conditions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDON (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1572. A bill to authorize the presentation of claims of the Coos (or Kowes) Bay, Lower Umpqua (or Kalawatset), and Siuslaw Tribes of Indians to the Indian Claims Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1573. A bill for the relief of Adone Lorenzetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONOR (for himself, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. DUFF, Mr. GREEN, Mr. IVES, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. TOBEY):

S. 1574. A bill to provide geographical equality for appointments to the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. O'CONOR when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1575. A bill relating to the survival of civil actions by or against public officers when such officers die, resign, or otherwise cease to hold office during the pendency of such actions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1576. A bill to clarify the status of apple cider under the laws relating to alcoholic beverages and under the Federal Alcohol Administration Act; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1577. A bill for the relief of Constantinous Tzortzis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1578. A bill to amend section 9 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, so as to give credit in accordance with such section for service rendered by officers and

employees of a Federal home-loan bank for service for which through inadvertence no deductions from salary were made; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENTON (for himself, Mr. HUNT, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1579. A bill to establish a National Citizens Advisory Board on Radio and Television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

GEOGRAPHICAL APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], my colleague, the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide geographical equality for appointments to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement by me, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 1574) to provide geographical equality for appointments to the Interstate Commerce Commission, introduced by Mr. O'CONOR (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of section 24 of the Interstate Commerce Act as reads "Not more than six commissioners shall be appointed from the same political party" (49 U. S. C., sec. 11), is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof ", nor shall more than four be appointed from the same geographical area. As used in this section the term "geographical area" shall mean any one of the following areas: (1) All States (excluding Wisconsin) which lie wholly east of the Mississippi River and north of the line formed by the Ohio River and the southern boundaries of West Virginia and Maryland, (2) all States which lie wholly east of the Mississippi River and south of the line formed by the Ohio River and the southern boundaries of West Virginia and Maryland, and (3) all States which lie wholly west of the Mississippi River, including Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Louisiana."

SEC. 2. This act shall be effective as of July 1, 1951. Commissioners serving under appointments made prior to that date shall not be required to be removed, but all appointments and reappointments made after that date shall be valid only if made in accordance with the provisions of this act.

The statement presented by Mr. O'CONOR is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

I have introduced in the Senate for myself and a group of other Senators a bill to make possible equal representation of the various sections of the country in the membership of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

For transportation purposes the United States is divided into three territories—the eastern territory, which generally is that group of States situated east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio and Potomac Rivers; the southern territory, comprised of those States east of the Mississippi and south of the Ohio and Potomac Rivers; and the western territory, which comprises the States lying west of the Mississippi River.

The following approximate percentage of the total United States population is located in the territories shown:

Eastern	47.25
Western	34.25
Southern	18.0

The percentage of the total freight transportation originated in the three territories is approximately the same as percentage in population located in each territory. On the basis of ton-miles of transportation performed, we find the east performing about 42 percent, the west about 43 percent, and the south about 15 percent. From the standpoint of passenger traffic, the division of passenger-miles handled is about the same as the percentage of population.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is composed of 11 members presently made up of 6 or 7 from the west, 3 from the southeastern territory, and 1 from the eastern territory. Thus a great preponderance of this membership is located in the western territory while the southeastern territory seems to have a little more than its percentage of population and transportation service performed would call for. The east with only one member, who is from the westernmost State (Illinois) in the eastern territory, is not adequately represented.

The Interstate Commerce Commission regulates transportation on a national basis but must constantly be aware of how its regulations will affect each separate section of the country. The members naturally draw on their personal experience for some of their knowledge about transportation. Thus when the collective experience of the membership barely touches on the territory comprising almost half of the population and performing almost half of the transportation service of the country, it might well be that the interests of this group are not properly represented in the deliberations of the Commission.

The purpose of the bill is to provide that not more than 4 members of the Commission should come from one of three areas described in the bill.

These areas are: (1) Eastern States, (2) Western States, (3) Southern States.

SURVIVAL OF CIVIL ACTIONS BY OR AGAINST CERTAIN PUBLIC OFFICERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill relating to the survival of civil actions by or against public officers when such officers die, resign, or otherwise cease to hold office during the pendency of such actions, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 1575) relating to the survival of civil actions by or against public officers when such officers die, resign, or otherwise cease to hold office during the pendency of such actions, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

Some months ago I was disturbed by a decision of the Supreme Court ruling that because of a legal technicality, the widow of a Navy petty officer was required to start all over again in her once successful effort to win a $1,365 lawsuit against the Navy. That legal technicality came about through no fault of her own but was related to the fact that the Navy had appointed a new Paymaster General and her court papers had failed to name that new appointee.

The Supreme Court, of course, undoubtedly ruled in accordance with the proper interpretation of the law. It is not for me to take issue with that. It does appear to me, however, that it would be most unfair to allow a statute to exist on the books which would interfere with the application of justice. A person who deserves a judgment on the basis of the merits of the case should not be prevented from receiving judgment simply because the holder of the office who is nominally being sued as a representative of the Government has been succeeded by another official.

The bill, which I introduced today, is designed to correct that inequity by amending the United States Code to provide that when a Government officer dies or otherwise ceases to hold office and is a party to legal action, he shall be deemed to have been substituted by his successor.

THE CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT—AMENDMENT

Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. NIXON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF IMMUNITY PROVISION RELATING TO TESTIMONY BY CERTAIN WITNESSES BEFORE CONGRESS—AMENDMENT

Mr. FERGUSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1570) to amend the immunity provision relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or their committees, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

treasure which, if we can avoid war, will bring giant industrial progress in the future. This is a case where swords can literally be beaten into plowshares—or, indeed, be beaten back into swords.

Mr. LINDLEY. Do you see any hope of ever achieving an agreement with the present Soviet regime on effective international control of atomic energy?

Senator MCMAHON. Effective international control of atomic energy means that the people of the free world and the people of the slave world must mingle. Soviet inspectors must come to the United States and American inspectors must go to Russia. Such a mingling of free men and slave men would be dangerous to the Kremlin. Its regimented followers might come to understand freedom and democracy and to resent the iron rule of the elite in Moscow. For that reason, the outlook for effective international control of atomic energy is not hopeful if the men of the Kremlin have their way. But I believe that a great campaign of truth can win the Russian people away from their masters and can thus pave the way for a just and completely trustworthy atomic-control system. We must use the time which our atomic stockpile buys us to attack the iron curtain and to win the Russian people toward our side.

Tribute to Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 31, 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Rapid City Daily Journal of Rapid City, S. Dak. This editorial is entitled "Faith Shows the Way." Faith is a South Dakota community of some 400 people who have undertaken to provide the community with a modern hospital by cooperating together in true frontier fashion in a "raising bee." I believe the project of this little community is somehow heartening during these days of deficit financing and that the spirit of faith which characterizes the citizens very excellently justifies the name of their city.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAITH SHOWS THE WAY

In ye olden days the "raising bee," with its variations, the quilting bee, the husking bee, etc., was a country-wide institution. The whole countryside gathered for a day of helping some settler raise the frame of his house, or some other cooperative purpose.

It was an institution that helped people get along in the pioneer days. It cut down costs. It saved time. This neighborhood cooperative effort was also a social institution. It made life more interesting and nejoyable, as well as being of great value in the development of the country.

The lively West River town of Faith and its loyal countryside has resorted to this pioneer institution of cooperative effort. Farmers, ranchers of the area, together with Faith residents drove into Rapid City, Thursday, with a fleet of trucks to secure material for the building of a hospital in Faith. It was quite a cavalcade and made a stir on the busy streets of Rapid City. Its members took lunch with the Rotary Club to the num- of 135 and gave that service club probably the biggest luncheon meeting in its history.

Faith, it seems, had planned to build a community hospital to cost $70,000. But the bids when received said $120,000 or more. So Faith consulted with its countryside and the idea of a "raising bee" was broached. It was enthusiastically received, as the cavalcade of trucks to Rapid City and the Rotary luncheon strikingly demonstrated.

Now Faith and its cooperative prairie neighborhood have the cost of that hospital figured down to some fifty-thousand odd dollars in cash. The parade of trucks to Rapid City is just a starter. The whole area is donating its time to build the hospital. It's a "raising bee" that will extend over some time. But it will get the job done.

Faith and its farmers and ranchers are displaying a splendid spirit of resourcefulness and determination. The whole State of South Dakota, and the Nation, will hurrah for them.

We want to be there when that hospital is dedicated.

Sale of Aircraft to Chinese Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 31, 1951

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I desire to have printed in the RECORD a London dispatch which appeared in the New York Times this morning, which is very interesting. It shows the differences in viewpoint between our own State Department and the British as to the ultimate disposition of the 71 aircraft at Hong Kong—American owned—40 of which have been awarded by the Supreme Court in Hong Kong to the Chinese Communists.

It also shows the difference in interpretation between our own State Department and the British of what are supposed to be our understandings about the embargo on war materials to Red China.

In addition to the London dispatch appearing in the New York Times, I also ask to have printed in the same connection an article entitled "UN Embargo Held Bar on 40 Planes to China," which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune yesterday, and a letter from Gen. Claire L. Chennault dated May 23, 1951, discussing the question of the airplanes.

There being no objection, the articles and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 31, 1951]

BRITISH SEE DELAY ON CHINESE PLANES—REGIME, UPSET BY HONG KONG RULING, RELIES ON APPEAL TO HALT TRANSFER TO REDS

LONDON, May 30.—British Government circles were obviously embarrassed and divided today over the disposition of 40 aircraft that the Hong Kong supreme court recently awarded to the Chinese Communist Government despite the claims of a United States-owned company.

Following the "great debate" in Washington over far-eastern policy, with its charges of British "appeasement" of the Chinese Communist regime, the decision of the colonial court has come at an acutely inconvenient time for Whitehall.

Officially, Government quarters put the best face they could on an admittedly explosive issue. They declared that the court's decision was being studied "from every aspect" and pointed out that there was no question of the physical transfer of planes for at least 2 months—until the American Civil Air Transport Co. had exercised its right to lodge an appeal.

Unofficially, however, it was evident that while confusion persisted over what to do with the planes, should the court's ruling be upheld, there was, nevertheless, almost unanimous agreement within the British Government that the planes should not be transferred to the Chinese Communists for many months, if ever.

In fact, the British Government, with its deep-seated respect for judical processes, expects—indeed hopes—that the Civil Air Transport Co. will appeal against the court's ruling and allow the matter to remain sub judice until it has reached the empire's highest tribunal, the Privy Council in London.

In this way Government circles see the only hope of steering between the Scylla of increased United States resentment and the Charybdis of Chinese Communist anger. An appeal up to the Privy Council might take at least a year and by that time the 40 planes might well be too obsolete to fly, as one Government official suggested.

LEGAL POSITION COMPLEX

The legal position in regard to the aircraft is exceptionally complex, it was agreed. Although "export" from the United Kingdom of aircraft assembled and unassembled has been subject to Government license since 1939, one authority explained that this does not automatically apply to colonies such as Hong Kong.

Therefore, the British Government, scenting trouble, issued on Order in Council on May 10, 1950, empowering the Governor of Hong Hong to forbid the planes to leave his jurisdiction until their ownership has been decided by the Hong Kong Supreme Court. Until the judicial process has been completed, this authority said, the planes will stay where they are.

It was further explained that the United Nations embargo on the export of strategic materials to Communist China did not automatically apply to the disputed aircraft. As the court has established, they are the property of the Peiping regime and their removal from Hong Kong thus would not be regarded necessarily as "exports."

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 30, 1951]

UN EMBARGO HELD BAR ON 40 PLANES TO CHINA—STATE DEPARTMENT AIDE SAYS RULING COVERS HONG KONG CRAFT CLAIMED BY CHENNAULT

WASHINGTON, May 29.—A State Department spokesman said today he believes the United Nations embargo against the Chinese Communists will spike a British-ordered transfer of 40 American-owned transport planes to Red China.

Michael J. McDermott, Department press officer, said the recent UN embargo decision covers the planes, which are grounded in Hong Kong, and they could not be exported to China.

Senator HARRY P. CAIN, Republican, Washington, earlier had written Secretary of State Dean Acheson demanding that every necessary diplomatic and economic step be taken to frustrate Britain's deliberate attempt to appease the Chinese Reds.

In addition to violating the UN embargo, Senator CAIN said, a British judge's ruling in favor of the Peking government would

aid the Red war effort in Korea and infringe upon the rights of Maj. Gen. Claire Chennault, of Flying Tiger fame, who now heads the Civil Air Transport, Inc., in Formosa.

The airline is American-owned and American-chartered. The firm bought 71 large planes from the Chinese Nationalists in 1949. Last week the Hong Kong judge ruled that CAT conspired with the illegal Nationalist government to deprive the Chinese people of their legal assets.

CAT will appeal the decision on the 40 planes to the full Crown Colony Supreme Court and to the British Privy Council if necessary. Ownership of the other 31 aircraft will be determined later.

The planes had been held at Hong Kong because of the Chinese Communist claims to possession. Mr. McDermott said until this is finally determined the British Governor of Hong Kong is charged with preventing their removal.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 23, 1951.*

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: This is the latest round in the fight which Mr. Willauer and I and our associates have been making for the last 18 months to make sure that this war-vital fleet of air-transport planes does not fall into the hands of the Chinese Communists—and it has never been more important than now that this should not happen.

Perhaps the British are subtle enough to understand how this action of their Hong Kong court can be squared with the United Nations embargo on the shipment of war materials to Red China—which the British say they are supporting. I am frank to say that I—and I think most simple-minded Americans—find this action incomprehensible.

The British may feel they have offset their action on these planes by their recent embargo on rubber shipments from Malaya to Communist China. But this embargo will not slow up the Reds for a long time to come. They have their British-fed stockpiles to draw on and they can still get rubber from Indonesia. These planes, however, give the Communists a tremendous lift to their war potential now just where they need it most—in air transport.

If this Hong Kong court decision and the Malayan rubber embargo were a trade, I say we have been traded a rabbit for a horse.

Yours sincerely,

C. L. CHENNAULT,
Major General,
United States Army, Retired.

Untruth Takes Time To Expose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 31, 1951

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Untruth Takes Time To Expose," written by David Lawrence, and published in the Washington Evening Star of May 30, 1951. I believe it is a most timely article, particularly in view of the facts which have been expressed on the floor of the Senate today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNTRUTH TAKES TIME TO EXPOSE—MISLEADING STATEMENTS CIRCULATED ABOUT MACARTHUR OFFSET FAVORABLE IMPRESSION GENERAL MADE ON CAPITOL HILL

(By David Lawrence)

Sometimes it takes a month or more to catch up with official propaganda and demonstrate some of its untruth. By that time impressions and prejudices have been formed and the propaganda has taken effect. Yet, in the interest of truthful reporting, the inaccuracies and misleading statements have to be exposed, no matter when the facts become available.

From one end of the country to the other on the morning of April 20, newspapers were given a sensational statement over which most of them quite naturally put a big headline on their front pages. It was the morning after General MacArthur had addressed Congress, and the administration was anxious to offset the favorable impression the general had made on Capitol Hill. In his address he had said that his views on what should be done in Korea—he gave four main points—were shared in the past by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The administration made no comment at that time on the four points, but it did issue a prepared statement endeavoring to create the impression that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had initiated the ouster of General MacArthur. The full text of that statement read as follows:

"In response to inquiries from the press concerning General MacArthur's reference to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a Pentagon spokesman said that the White House had authorized him to state that the action taken by the President in relieving General MacArthur was based on the unanimous recommendations of the President's principal civilian and military advisers, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The reasons for General MacArthur's relief have been stated previously by the President."

Here is the verbatim comment on this as made by General Collins, Chief of Staff, of the United States Army, and a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testifying under oath before the Senate committee:

"Senator KNOWLAND. Now on about April 19 there was a press release, presumably from the Pentagon, because it quoted an unknown Pentagon spokesman, that said that the action of the removal of General MacArthur * * * had had the unanimous recommendation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. As I understand your testimony today, it was a concurrence of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, because you have testified that of their own motion the Joint Chiefs made no such recommendation.

"General COLLINS. Yes, sir. * * * I want to make it very clear, certainly I, and I don't believe any other members of the Chiefs themselves, to the best of my knowledge, saw that press release. Commotion is such, we have got a terribly complicated business we conduct, and to my recollection I never saw the press release prior to the time it was released. I don't know who it was that released it. It may have been by those who issue what comes out of the Secretary of Defense Office, the civilian in charge of that, and the exact technical connotation of recommendation may never have occurred to him. I don't know.

"Senator KNOWLAND. At any rate, you are not the Pentagon spokesman who gave the release?

"General COLLINS. No, sir.

"Senator KNOWLAND. And do you know that any of the Chiefs were directly involved?

"General COLLINS. I am quite sure that none of us saw it. I am not positive."

Now when that statement was first issued, this correspondent called attention to its inaccuracy and drew attention to the fact that the White House had officially approved and authorized it and had not withdrawn it. The Democratic National Committee, in its tabloid newspaper issued a few days later, repeated the text of the Pentagon statement and claimed it gave the official facts of the MacArthur case. The statement has never been disavowed by the White House or by the Pentagon. It still remains in the minds of many people as an official pronouncement. It is still being used as ammunition throughout the country by 50,000 workers in the Democratic Party's national organization.

Misleading statements have also been widely disseminated concerning the four points mentioned by General MacArthur in his address to Congress. His exact words were "that from a military standpoint the above views have been fully shared in the past by practically every military leader concerned with the Korean campaign, including our own Joint Chiefs of Staff."

Efforts have since been made by administration Senators at the hearing to claim that the views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were offered only when it looked like evacuation from Korea might be necessary and that the much-discussed January 12 memo of the Joint Chiefs was only a staff "study" and that it was subsequently superseded when our troops were able to stay in Korea. Here is some verbatim testimony on that issue:

"Senator HICKENLOOPER. Was General MacArthur ever notified any time after January 12 up until his release that the Joint Chiefs of Staff were withdrawing any of those proposals?

"General COLLINS. We withdrew none of these proposals. We haven't withdrawn them right now."

General Collins reiterated the same point in answering questions of Senator MORSE of Oregon, who inquired whether he had changed his mind about the January 12 proposals. He said he had not and that the real question was solely one of timing—when to put the recommendations into effect. This is far from a contradiction of General MacArthur's declaration that "from a military standpoint" his views as to what should be done "have been fully shared in the past" by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Effect of Section 407, Agricultural Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1951

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the proposal that Territorial residents should not receive the cost-of-living allowances paid Federal employees, I desire to submit a statement prepared by the Juneau (Alaska) chapter of the National Federation of Federal Employees. This shows how unfair such a proposal is. Carrying out such a plan would be more costly than the present system, would discriminate against American citizens, and would create administrative chaos:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES, LOCAL NO. 251,
Juneau, Alaska, May 15, 1951.

FACT SHEET—EFFECT OF SECTION 407 OF HOUSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952, ON DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AGENCIES IN ALASKA

Section 407 of the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for fiscal year 1952

limits the cost-of-living allowance to persons recruited in continental United States and denies it to resident Alaskans.

Juneau local, No. 251, National Federation of Federal Employees, strongly protests this action for the following reasons:

1. It is grossly unfair to resident Alaskans:
2. It will immediately cripple Department of Agriculture activities in Alaska.
3. It will increase operation costs of Department of Agriculture agencies in Alaska.

1. It is grossly unfair to resident Alaskans: There is no difference in living habits and living costs between the resident Alaskan and the employee recruited in the States. Both shop in the same stores, eat the same kinds of food, live under the same housing conditions, buy the same kinds of clothing and participate in the same types of recreational activities. A great majority of Federal employees hired as Alaskan residents came from continental United States and received their education there. In many cases, an employee hired as a resident Alaskan is a comparative newcomer from the States who has preferred to pay his own transportation in order to seek and select employment of the type he desires and with the agency of his choice.

Under the proposal in section 407, two equally competent stenographers could work at the same grade, live together, and share expenses. One, recruited stateside, brought to Alaska at Federal expense, receives a 25 percent cost-of-living allowance; the other, recruited locally, either as a bona fide Alaska resident or one who has paid her own way to Alaska to seek employment, does not receive the cost-of-living allowance. We would find supervisors receiving smaller salaries than those working under them. Such situations would be manifestly unjust, and intolerable to the Alaska resident.

The cost-of-living allowance is designed to offset the higher cost of living in Alaska in comparison with that in Washington, D. C., up to a 25-percent maximum. All realistic cost-of-living studies made during the last 10 years have demonstrated that the cost of living in southeastern Alaska (the least expensive section) is at least 25 percent above that in Washington, D. C. A recent Bureau of Labor Statistics survey shows that the cost of living during February 1951 in Anchorage and Fairbanks, Alaska was 40 percent and 47 percent, respectively, above Seattle, Wash. These conclusions were recognized as valid by the Civil Service Commission when, following the instructions in Executive Order No. 10,000, it established the Alaska cost-of-living allowance at the maximum, 25 percent.

It must also be pointed out that the 25 percent cost of living allowance in Alaska is subject to both Federal and Territorial income taxes, and consequently is reduced to an actual allowance of less than 20 percent.

Salaries in many grades of Federal employment, even including the 25 percent cost of living allowance, are lower than in comparable employment in private industry. For example, an inexperienced graduate forester will receive only $1.86 per hour (GS–5), or, if he has worked summers and gained some professional experience, he can be started at $2.30 per hour (GS–7). Minus the 25 percent cost of living allowance, the hourly rates would be $1.49 per hour (GS–5) and $1.84 per hour (GS–7). This same college graduate can work for a contractor on one of the road jobs in interior Alaska as driver of a pickup truck and receive a minimum of $2.87 per hour; or, driving a larger truck, a minimum of $3.32 per hour; or as a common laborer, a minimum of $2.77 per hour. Overtime at time and a half or double time further increases the disparity between the earnings of the Federal worker and the employee of a private contractor.

Wages for clerical employees under the Alaska merit system are at higher rates than for Federal employees on comparable work. A GS–4 clerk-stenographer in Federal service starts at $1.38 per hour base pay, or $1.75 per hour including 25 percent cost of living allowance. A Territorial employee in a comparable position under the merit system starts at $1.88 per hour in southeastern Alaska, $2.06 per hour in interior Alaska.

2. It will immediately cripple Department of Agriculture activities in Alaska: Many career employees in the Department of Agriculture agencies in the Territory want to remain in their present jobs, but should section 407 remain in the Agriculture appropriation bill, employees affected will be forced to seek other employment for economic reasons. Many capable and experienced keymen will be lost. The following data indicates how widespread and serious such an exodus will be in the Department of Agriculture:

Agency	Total regular employees	Recruited stateside	Recruited	
			Alaska	Percent
Agriculture Research Administration	27	11	16	59
Farmers Home Administration	2	0	2	100
Forest Service	58	29	29	50
Rural Electrification Administration	5	5	0	--------
Soil Conservation Service	9	6	3	33
Total	101	51	50	50

It will be impossible to recruit local replacements. The only alternative for the agencies will be to recruit replacements in continental United States and train them on the job. Past experience has proven the hazards of stateside recruitment. In spite of the great care taken in selecting stateside employees, a high percentage of them become dissatisfied and leave within 1 to 3 years because of (1) high cost of living, (2) lack of adequate housing, (3) isolation, (4) unfavorable weather. As a result, local qualified people familiar with Alaskan conditions have been more satisfactory. The situation would completely demoralize and disorganize the agencies affected.

3. It will increase operation costs of Department of Agriculture agencies in Alaska: The enactment of section 407 will increase the cost to the Federal Government as follows:

(a) Recruiting replacements: Replacements will have to be obtained stateside. The Federal Government pays the cost of transporting a new employee and his dependents and household goods from point of hire in the States to the job in Alaska. This may cost $1,000 or more for an employee with a family. In addition, each such employee is guaranteed return transportation if he remains on the job for a specified period (1 to 3 years). Such costs are saved when resident Alaskans are hired.

(b) Training: New employees replacing resident Alaskans must be trained. On most jobs it will be from several months to 2 years before they are as proficient as the employees they replaced.

(c) Turnover: A righ percentage of employees from the States return to the States as soon as their 1-to-3 year contract is fulfilled because they dislike the weather, isolation, hardships, or for some other reason. Many leave even before their contracts are fulfilled. Federal agencies therefore recruit locally whenever qualified applicants are available. The resident Alaskan, or person who has come to Alaska on his own initiative and at his own expense to seek employment in a job and agency most satisfactory to him, is far more likely to remain with that agency over a long term of years than is the average stateside recruit.

(d) Lowered morale: The threat of section 407 has already created unrest among Agriculture employees. They realize its unfairness and the impossibility of Alaska residents continuing work without the 25 percent cost-of-living allowance. This cannot help but adversely affect their work.

In summary, all who are acquainted with the facts as they actually exist clearly recognize the fallacy of a policy that would deprive resident Aaskans of the cost-of-living allowance. From the standpoint of good administration, it is completely indefensible to have two different compensation schedules for competent employees, doing the same work equally well, and living according to the same standards. Furthermore, it is manifestly in the best interests of the Federal Government to continue the cost-of-living allowance in Alaska to all Department of Agriculture personnel, whether recruited in Alaska or stateside. In view thereof, section 407 should be eliminated.

J. T. PETRICH,
President.

The Big Truth Versus the Big Doubt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 31, 1951

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan at the Democratic National Committee Midwest and Western States Conference on Thursday, May 24, 1951, in Denver, Colo. The subject of the Secretary's address was the Big Truth Versus the Big Doubt.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BIG TRUTH VERSUS THE BIG DOUBT

(By Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan)

I approach my task tonight with a feeling of special responsibility.

These are deadly serious times. These are times when every government—every political party—and all mature-thinking men and women—ought to lay aside prejudice and emotionalism in order to examine very diligently into their convictions, and their duties. These are times to search out and speak the truth—the big truth that will dispel the big doubt.

We are here tonight because we are Democrats.

Why are we Democrats?

What does it mean to be a Democrat?

What are the responsibilities of Democrats?

For 15 years the Republican national leadership has been campaigning on the line that really there's not too much difference between the aims of the two major parties. They have contended after the adoption of the measures that they, too, stand for the social and economic reforms brought about in recent Democratic administrations—only they would have made a far better job of administering them.

Alf Landon said something like that in 1936.

Wendell Willkie said it in 1940.

Governor Dewey said it—twice.

But the people didn't believe them, and it is easy to see why.

It was because all the while they were seeking to lay claim to Democratic accomplishments, they never failed to say in the same speeches—and sometimes even in the same breath—that Democratic policies threatened our basic institutions and fundamental freedoms.

They did not fool anybody but themselves.

The fundamental characteristic of the Democratic Party is that it stands for economic and political freedom. It has always been devoted primarily to the defense of human rights, and it still is today. Throughout most of its 150-year history, the Democratic Party has fought the battle of the people. Today there is a new scheme to attack the Democratic Party because it fights the battle of the people.

It is conducted by a league of men who are the apostles of confusion and fear. Either they have lost confidence in the ability of the people to rule—or what is more likely, they have never had it. They have always wanted government by the special interests.

They are like scarecrows in a corn field—swaying whichever way the wind happens to blow, in an effort to get partisan advantages.

When the President acted to stop aggression in Korea, they caught their breath, and then when the people approved, they applauded. But when our forces were being driven back—they wailed that we should never had gone into Korea.

When UN forces landed at Inchon and after that chased the Reds across the thirty-eighth parallel, they wailed that we should never have crossed the parallel. They conceded that the struggle was lost. Might as well get out of Korea, they said. Now, some of them want to conquer the vast hordes and expanses of China.

What they'll say tomorrow, no one knows.

But one thing we can be sure of—it will depend completely on which way the wind happens to be blowing.

Senator TAFT is a prime exponent of this wind-blown thinking. Even his admirers are confused. Last June Senator TAFT feared that our operations against the North Koreans might lead the Russians to start a third world war. But now he calls for more aggressive military action against the Chinese Communists. Now he thinks there's not much danger of war with Russia. He goes even further. In the same speech in which he calls for more aggressive military action, he proposes that we cut $20,000,000,000 out of the national mobilization budget and lower the strength of our planned Armed Forces by half a million men.

Such confused and vacillating critics pretend for obvious political reasons that this administration does not have a consistent foreign policy.

The facts are that our foreign policy has been not merely consistent, but in the overall it has been highly successful. We have sought to hold back the spread of communism while at the same time avoiding a third world war.

To make such a foreign policy effective, we have had to preserve and expand our economic strength.

The two requirements had to dovetail—the first could not survive without the second.

This administration has accomplished both these difficult tasks. That is why historians will someday rate the Truman administration as among the most successful in American history.

All the maligning and misrepresentation—all the base appeals to fear and doubt—all the reckless accusations unsupported by even a shred of proof—all of the often-repeated big doubts will not, cannot, wipe out the fundamental truths.

Here is one of those truths. Today nearly 6 years after the end of actual combat in World War II, the national economy has never been so productive—and so strong.

Private enterprise has never flourished anywhere as it flourishes today in this country.

This health and vigor of our domestic economy is our great economic bulwark against communism here in the United States. But it is also the basis upon which we have built a consistent and successful foreign policy.

That this foreign policy has been consistent and successful is, of course, being challenged by those who hope to win a political campaign by creating and exploiting the "big doubt."

After five consecutive defeats in presidential elections, and after losing all but one off-year election for Members of Congress in the past two decades, our political opponents recognize at least that they cannot unseat the Democratic leadership by frankly debating the issues.

Now some of them are trying a new strategy—the strategy of sowing doubt and confusion in the minds of the people. Mr. Jon Jonkel, a Chicago public relations man and a campaign director for recently-elected Senator BUTLER of Maryland, openly identified the big doubt as an accepted Republican campaign technique. Incidentally, Mr. Jonkel is now under indictment for violation of Maryland's election laws.

The strategy is to keep playing over and over a few ugly refrains—again and again, like old broken records.

They say this administration doesn't have a definite foreign policy. They say we've been soft toward communism. They say we've thrown away all that this Nation fought to win in World War II.

I say to you that no political criticism in modern American history is more completely refuted by the facts than these ugly, broken-down charges.

Let's look at those facts—the facts and the results.

When the war ended, much of the world was hungry and devastated. Communism threatened to sweep over most of Western Europe, as well as the Middle East and Far East. Starvation was communism's greatest ally. So we fought starvation.

We fed the hungry people in the war-torn areas, who were ripe for communism, with a generosity no nation ever before displayed. From July 1945 to June 1947, we exported more than 36,000,000 tons of food. Over half of all the grain that moved in the world trade in those years came from this country. And our farmers kept on setting new production records to make these exports possible.

We cooperated fully in the new international organizations: the United Nations, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the World Bank, and others.

Was this throwing away what we fought for? Can the sowers of doubt and suspicion find any soft policy toward communism in these actions?

When the Soviet Union saw that communism's most effective arguments, hunger and deprivation, were being countered in this way, the men in the Kremlin sought to achieve their designs by showing their teeth and claws. They encouraged guerrilla warfare in Greece. They threatened the stability of the Government of Turkey.

That was when—in the spring of 1947—the President proposed the doctrine that this Nation should support free peoples resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside Communist pressures. This is known as the Truman doctrine. He went before the Congress and he got aid for Greece—over the determined opposition of Republican isolationist leadership. We sent a military mission and military equipment to that country. To lead it, we sent the same General Van Fleet who commands our forces in Korea. Greece won that struggle against communism. Today the Greek Army is a fine fighting machine and a source of real strength among the free nations of Europe.

Was aid to Greece inconsistent with our policy of supporting free peoples? Was it being soft toward communism?

Turkey was also being threatened by mounting Communist pressure. If Turkey fell under Communist domination it would mean the loss of the Dardanelles and the gateway to the east. We sent aid to Turkey as we had to Greece. And the Turkish Government stood firm. It still stands firm today.

Let's see who it was who really would have thrown away what we fought for in World War II. In four roll-call votes in the Senate and House on the issue of aid to Greece and Turkey, 88 percent of the Democrats voted for aid. But 80 percent of the votes against this Truman doctrine came from Republicans.

Let's see who was really being soft to the "commies."

In March 1947 the Communist Daily Worker called the Truman doctrine an "empire grab, masked by anti-Communist hysteria."

Two months later, Republican Congressman BENDER described it as a "monstrosity." And Republican Congressman HOFFMAN called the whole thing a fraud and said that the United States was in no danger from any foreign power.

Which party had swallowed the Commie line?

In June 1947, Secretary of State Marshall proposed a program of aid to the nations of Western Europe—a program that as we look back upon it, seems to have been providentially inspired.

Italy at that time was ripe for communism. Her people were submerged in economic hopelessness. There are two main reasons why Italy is not within the Communist orbit today. One was the determined fight put up by the Catholic Church—the other was the hope and courage, and the food that fed hope and courage, made possible by the Marshall plan.

In Italy, in France, in other countries of Western Europe, Marshall plan aid made it possible for the people to beat communism where it counted the most—in the voting booth. Our aid gave the people courage to fight back against Communist infiltration.

Throughout practically all of Western Europe today production and employment have bounded above prewar levels—largely because of the impetus provided by the Marshall plan. Every day the Communist threat within these countries grows weaker. And now, under General Eisenhower, these nations are building a united defense against the Communist threat from behind the iron curtain. Was any of this inconsistent? Can the doubters and confusers find here a soft policy toward communism? Can they point out where we threw away anything we had fought to win in World War II?

But what about the votes? During the past 4 years, the Democrats in Congress have voted 92 percent for a strong Marshall plan. The Republican support at its high point was only 75 percent; and last year only 46 percent of the Republicans in Congress voted for the aid program.

Back in June 1947, Pravda, the official Russian newspaper, described the Marshall plan as "a plan of political pressure, with the help of dollars, a plan of interference in the internal affairs of European countries."

Senator TAFT, chairman of the Republican Policy Committee, in a speech in November 1947, said the Marshall plan would "encourage unsound policies in Europe and * * * force futile and dangerous regimentation on American productivity."

One of the Russian generals speaking from Moscow in October 1947 said: "The U. S. S. R. will put all effort in seeing that the Marshall plan is not realized."

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS, 1st Session | SENATE | REPORT No. 561

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

JULY 20 (legislative day, JUNE 27), 1951.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 3973]

The Committee on Appropriations to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made:

Amount of bill as passed House (direct appropriations)	$717,295,233
Amount of increase by Senate committee (net)	34,474,897
Amount of bill as reported to Senate	751,770,130
Amount of appropriations, 1951 (as reduced under Section 1214)	776,199,700
Amount of estimates for 1952	820,205,546
The bill as reported to the Senate:	
Under the appropriations for 1951	24,429,570
Under the estimates for 1952	68,435,416

Summary of appropriations, loan authorization, 1951, and budget estimates and appropriations, 1952

[NOTE.—Figures in brackets [ ] not included in totals. The 1951 amounts do not include estimated additional amounts required to meet the Pay Act increase.]

Item	1951, as reduced under sec. 1214	Budget estimates, 1952	House bill, 1952	Increase (+) or decrease (−), House bill compared with—		Senate bill, 1952	Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with—		
				Appropriations, 1951, as reduced under sec. 1214	Budget estimates, 1952		Appropriations, 1951, as reduced under sec. 1214	Budget estimates, 1952	House bill, 1952
Direct appropriations:									
Title I—Regular activities	$775,800,700	$786,605,546	$716,845,233	−$58,955,467	−$69,760,313	$751,120,130	−$24,680,570	−$35,485,416	+$34,274,897
Title II—Special activities	399,000	33,600,000	450,000	+51,000	−33,150,000	650,000	+251,000	−32,950,000	+200.000
Total, direct appropriations	776,199,700	820,205,546	717,295,233	−58,904,467	−102,910,313	751,770,130	−24,429,570	−68,435,416	+34,474,897
Permanent appropriations	130,532,015	[1] 172,177,264	172,177,264	+41,645,249	----------	172,177,264	+41,645,249	----------	----------
Loan authorizations	444,500,000	262,000,000	251,250,000	−193,250,000	−10,750,000	262,000,000	−182,500,000	----------	+10,750,000
Administrative expense limitations	23,234,000	24,154,000	18,954,000	−4,280,000	−5,200,000	20,454,000	−2,780,000	−3,700,000	+1,500,000

[1] Includes $76,808,000 proposed in budget for transfer to International Wheat Agreement. This proposal not included in House bill or Senate committee bill.

Increases and Limitations

The changes recommended by the committee in the amounts of the House bill are as follows:

Research and Marketing Act of 1946 ..... $150,000

The increase recommended by the committee is a partial restoration of the House reduction. The committee believes that in allocating funds to the projects the Department should give priority to those that are worked out on a matching fund basis in cooperation with State agencies. The total amount provided is $4,850,000, which is $650,000 below the budget estimate.

With reference to the limitation on work relating to fish or shellfish except for the support of equitable transportation rates and for development of foreign markets, the committee is again advised, as it was last year, that the workload on transportation rates is being carried by one full-time employee. The committee suggests that consideration be given to the advisability of assigning additional personnel to this work, at least on a part-time basis.

Bureau of Agricultural Economics:

Economic investigations 250,000

The increase recommended by the committee is a partial restoration of the House reduction. The total amount provided is $2,250,000, which is $279,000 below the budget estimate.

Agricultural Research Administration:

Research on Agricultural Problems of Alaska 11,550

The increase recommended by the committee is a partial restoration of the House reduction. The total amount provided is $261,550, which is $18,450 below the budget estimate.

Office of Experiment Stations:

Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico 15,000

The increase recommended by the committee is a partial restoration of the House reduction. The total amount provided is $12,431,208, which is $22,500 below the budget estimate.

The committee also recommends that the amount for extending the benefits of the Adams and Purnell Acts to the Territory of Alaska be increased from $37,500 to $52,500, which is $22,500 below the estimate.

Bureau of Animal Industry:

Animal research 120,000

The increase recommended by the committee is a partial restoration of the House reduction. The total amount provided is $3,320,700, which is $218,700 below the budget estimate.

Bureau of Dairy Industry 41,000

The increase recommended by the committee is a partial restoration of the House reduction. The total amount provided is $1,491,000, which is $98,000 below the budget estimate.

Increases and Limitations—Continued

Agricultural Research Administration—Continued

Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry.. $100,000

The increase recommended by the committee is a partial restoration of the House reduction. The total amount provided is $7,300,000, which is $667,000 below the budget estimate.

Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering:

Plant, Soil, and Agricultural Engineering Research..... 238,330

The increase recommended by the committee is the net result of the reduction of the $85,670 required by the amendment providing for 10 percent reduction for personal services, with exceptions as stated, and the following increases recommended by the committee:

Construction and equipment of laboratory at Orlando, Fla., for citrus and subtropical fruit research....	$275,000
Hybrid onion research at Parma, Idaho, station.....	9,000
Research on wheat mosaic.....	40,000
Total increase.....	324,000

The total amount provided is $10,589,730, which is $46,670 below the budget estimate.

The committee also recommends that the following be inserted in the bill:

including not to exceed $275,000 for the construction of a laboratory at Orlando, Florida.

The committee is advised that the scientist quartered at Sacramento, Calif., doing research work on almonds and walnuts is soon to retire, and the committee hopes that within the funds available an understudy may be assigned to work with him before he retires, in order to retain to the research work the benefit of his specialized knowledge.

Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine:

Insect investigations..... 272,725

The increase recommended by the committee is a partial restoration of the House reduction, and is intended for the following:

Additional amount for miscellaneous insects attacking cereal and grass crops (including green bugs and chinch bugs).....	$40,000
Estimated increase for carriers of oak wilt and control methods.....	15,000
Funds to undertake control methods for eradication of screw worm through use of radiant energy.....	20,000

Also, additional funds as may be required for strengthening research on wheat stem sawfly. The balance of the increase is intended to lessen the curtailment of research that would be required by the House reduction, such as the work on Japanese beetle parasites and diseases.

The total amount provided is $3,797,725, which is $110,275 below the budget estimate.

Increases and Limitations—Continued

Agricultural Research Administration—Continued

Insect and plant disease control	$216,062

The increase recommended by the committee is a partial restoration of the House reduction. The total amount provided is $4,716,062, which is $43,938 below the budget estimate.

Total increase, Agricultural Research Administration	1,014,667

Control of forest pests:

Forest Pest Control Act	1,900,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide funds for the Colorado spruce bark beetle control project, estimated at $3,750,000 and for which the House allowed nothing. The total amount provided is $3,600,000, which is $2,143,000 below the budget estimate.

Forest Service:

National forest protection and management	400,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide additional funds, as a partial restoration of the House reduction, for administering timber sales for the purpose of expediting timber sales in the national forests. The total amount provided is $27,522,025, which is $2,132,975 below the budget estimate.

Forest development roads and trails	3,000,000

The increase recommended by the committee is a partial restoration of the House reduction and is to provide additional funds for constructing access roads for the purpose of expediting timber sales in the national forests. The total amount provided is $14,500,000, which is $3,000,000 below the budget estimate.

Acquisition of lands for national forests:

Weeks Act	50,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to restore the budget estimate of $100,000.

Superior National Forest	50,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to restore the budget estimate of $150,000.

Cooperative range improvements	700,000

The committee recommends, in order to provide a direct appropriation instead of an indefinite sum as estimated, that the following paragraph be inserted in the bill:

Cooperative Range Improvements

For artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious plants on national forests, as authorized by sec. 12 of the act of Apr. 24, 1950 (Public Law 478), $700,000, to remain available until expended.

Total increase, Forest Service	4,200,000

Increases and Limitations—Continued

Flood control $260,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide $200,000 as a partial restoration of the House reduction on surveys and to provide $60,000 for surveys of the watersheds of the Big Nemaha River, Little Nemaha River, and Weeping Water Creek in Nebraska. The total amount provided is $6,372,800, which is $2,527,200 below the budget estimate.

The committee also recommends that the following proviso be inserted in the bill:

: Provided further: That not in excess of $60,000 of the funds made available herein may be used for surveys of the watersheds of the Big Nemaha River, Little Nemaha River, and Weeping Water Creek in Nebraska and such surveys shall be coordinated with the investigations of the Corps of Engineers

The committee believes that funds provided for flood control in this bill should be used only for agricultural purposes, and in no event should such funds be allocated to the Interior Department.

Soil Conservation Service:

Water conservation and utilization projects 100,000

The increase recommended by the committee is a partial restoration of the House reduction. The total amount provided is $285,500, which is $214,500 below the budget estimate.

Production and Marketing Administration:

Conservation and use of agricultural land resources .. 23,500,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to partially restore the House reduction, in order to provide funds to meet the commitments under the 1951 crop year program and to provide in part for advances of materials on the program authorized for the 1952 crop year, and thus reduce the amount required to be borrowed from the Commodity Credit Corporation for such advances. The total amount provided is $280,000,000, which is $5,000,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee also recommends that the amount of the program authorized for the 1952 crop year be increased from $225,000,000 to $280,000,000, which is $5,000,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee also recommends that the following be deleted from the bill:

> That not to exceed 5 per centum of the allocation for the agricultural conservation program for any county may be allotted with the approval of the State committee to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program and the funds so allotted shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such county.

Increases and Limitations—Continued

Production and Marketing Administration—Continued

Conservation and use of agricultural land resources—Continued

and that the following be inserted in lieu thereof:

That not to exceed 5 per centum of the allocation for the agricultural conservation program for any county may, on the recommendation of such county committee and approval of the State committee, be withheld and allotted to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program in the participating counties, and the funds so allotted may be placed in a single account for each State, and shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such counties.

Agricultural production programs $3,700,000

The increase recommended by the committee is a partial restoration of the House reduction. The total amount provided is $12,000,000, which is $8,000,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee also recommends that the amount of the limitation on the transfer to "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938" be increased from $2,000,000 to $2,800,000.

Marketing Services.

The committee recommends that the following proviso be deleted from the bill:

That hereafter appropriations available for classing or grading any agricultural commodity without charge to the producers thereof may be reimbursed from nonadministrative funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the cost of classing or grading any such commodity for producers who are eligible to obtain Commodity Credit Corporation price support.

and that the following be inserted in lieu thereof:

That hereafter there may be transferred to appropriations available for classing or grading any agricultural commodity without charge to the producers thereof such sums from nonadministrative funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation as may be necessary in addition to other funds available for these purposes, such transfers to be reimbursed from subsequent appropriations therefor.

Total increase, Production and Marketing Administration 27,200,000

Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan authorizations.

The committee recommends that the amount of the contingent authorization for additional amounts that may be borrowed for the rural electrification program to the extent required for the development of the program be reduced from $100,000,000 to $75,000,000.

The committee also recommends that the amount of $25,000,000 be provided as a contingent authorization for additional amounts that may be borrowed for the rural-telephone program to the extent required for the development of the program.

Increases and Limitations—Continued

Rural Electrification Administration—Continued

Loan authorizations—Continued

It was brought to the attention of the committee in the course of the hearings that the Rural Electrification Administration had adopted a new policy with respect to its loans. This policy gives the Department of Labor the power to control the wages paid for work done by the farmers' electric cooperatives.

In some cases the wages required in farm communities by the Department of Labor have been wholly unrealistic when compared with the actual prevailing wage. For example, based on an 8-hour day, some farmer organizations, functioning exclusively in rural areas, would be required to pay a hole digger $20 a day. The Department of Labor sought to require in a rural community of 850 people that the farm electric cooperative pay a lineman $20 a day and a carpenter $24 a day for an 8-hour day. The committee believes that such wages for the construction of rural electrification lines and facilities are likely to seriously impair the farm cooperatives' ability to repay their loans. If they had been in existence during the history of the REA, the farmers' lines could not have been economically built, financed, or operated.

The committee has been unable to find any law authorizing or directing the Rural Electrification Administration to give the Department of Labor dictatorial power over wages paid by the borrower farm cooperatives. If the Secretary of Agriculture or the Administrator of REA feel that they are unable to perform their duties without empowering the Department of Labor to impose such restrictions, they should come to the Congress and request specific legislation authorizing and directing such a policy. In the absence of such a statute the Committee feels that the action of the Department of Agriculture and the Rural Electrification Administration is unwise and unwarranted.

Farmers Home Administration:

Loan authorization.

The committee recommends that the amount of the borrowing authorization for production and subsistence loans under title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act be increased from $100,000,000 to $110,000,000, the full amount of the budget estimate.

The committee also recommends that the amount of the borrowing authorization for water facilities loans under the act of Aug. 28, 1937, be increased from $4,250,000 to $5,000,000, the full amount of the budget estimate.

Salaries and expenses $650,000

The increase recommended by the committee is partial restoration of the House reduction. The total amount provided is $28,150,000, which is $1,550,000 below the budget estimate.

Increases and Limitations—Continued

Farm Credit Administration $100,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to partially restore the House reduction in the direct appropriation for cooperative work. The committee is advised that, in general, the research activities for the benefit of cooperatives does not pertain to particular farmers' cooperatives to the extent that the expense of the activity could be charged to such cooperatives. The total amount provided is $400,000, which is $180,000 below the budget estimate for the direct appropriation. Together with $2,325,000 from assessments against member institutions of the Farm Credit system, the total amount available for necessary expenses is $2,725,000.

Title II—Special Activities:

Research on strategic and critical agricultural materials 200,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide for the amounts in the supplemental estimate in S. Doc. No. 45 of $125,000 for expanding research on the development of replacements for specific applications of stockpiled castor oil and of $75,000 for research to accelerate the domestic production of castor beans as a source of castor oil. The total amount provided is $650,000, which is $250,000 below the revised estimate of $900,000.

Total increases 36,024,667

Title III—Corporations:

Commodity Credit Corporation:

The committee recommends that the limitation on the amount available for administrative expenses be increased from $15,000,000 to $16,500,000, which is $3,700,000 below the budget estimate.

Title IV—General Provisions:

Sec. 407: Limiting pay outside continental United States to rates paid for comparable work within continental United States, except for resident citizens of continental United States.

The committee recommends that the following section be deleted from the bill:

> Sec. 407. No part of the funds made available by this Act may be used to compensate any person for employment in the Federal service outside the continental limits of the United States at a rate higher than is paid for comparable work in the Federal service within the continental limits of the United States, other than a person who was a resident citizen of the continental United States at the date of his appointment to a position outside the continental limits of the United States and has had continuous employment in the Federal service (except as interrupted by service in the Armed Forces of the United States) from the date of such appointment.

INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS—Continued

Sec. 410: Limitation on filling positions (Jensen amendment).

The committee has applied a 10 percent personal services reduction to all administrative, supervisory, clerical and other employees in the Washington area, in regional and State offices, and in the major laboratories, but has exempted field operating and research employees engaged in work of county offices, and other field locations. The only other exemption is for the vital crop and livestock reporting service where a general 10 percent cut would disrupt the timeliness, accuracy, and coverage of these essential reports.

Accordingly, the committee recommends that the following section be deleted from the bill:

"SEC. 410. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within the agency;

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to seasonal and casual workers;

"(e) to meat inspectors;

"(f) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2;

"(g) To field employees of the Soil Conservation Service and Production Marketing Administration who provide conservation assistance to farmers and ranchers:

"*Provided further*, That when any department or agency covered in this Act has reduced their employment rolls to 80 per centum of the total number of their rolls as of July 1, 1951, this limitation may cease to apply."

and that the following be inserted in lieu thereof:

SEC. 409. In order to effect reductions in appropriations for personal services equivalent to 10 percent or more below the 1952 budget estimates, except for field operating and research employees engaged in work of county offices and other field locations, and except for the crop and livestock reporting service, the following appropriations have been reduced in the amounts indicated and obligations for personal services shall not exceed the amount included in the budget estimate less the amount so indicated, respectively, for each appropriation:

Research and Marketing Act of 1946	*$235, 268*
Bureau of Agricultural Economics:	
Economic investigations	*168, 663*
Crop and livestock estimates	*17, 696*
Agricultural Research Administration:	
Office of Administrator	*45, 560*
Research on Agricultural Problems of Alaska	*18, 450*
Research on Strategic and Critical Agricultural Materials	*33, 580*

Increases and Limitations—Continued

Title IV—General Provisions—Continued

Sec. 410: Limitation on filling positions—Con.

Office of Experiment Stations:	
Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico	*$12, 990*
Salaries and expenses	*32, 910*
Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics	*111, 670*
Bureau of Animal Industry:	
Salaries and expenses:	
Animal research	*215, 671*
Animal disease control and eradication	*186, 978*
Marketing agreements, hog cholera, virus and serum	*1, 394*
Meat inspection	*48, 012*
Bureau of Dairy Industry	*97, 510*
Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry	*585, 949*
Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering:	
Plant, soil, and agricultural engineering research	*370, 670*
National Arboretum	*11, 680*
Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine:	
Salaries and expenses:	
Insect investigations	*110, 275*
Insect and plant disease control	*43, 938*
Plant quarantines	*30, 483*
Control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases	*6. 871*
Control of forest pests:	
Forest Pest Control Act	*3, 286*
White pine blister rust	*25, 737*
Forest Service:	
Salaries and expenses:	
National forest protection and management	*373, 351*
Forest research	*278, 897*
Forest development roads and trails	*116, 047*
Acquisition of lands for national forests:	
Weeks Act	*897*
Special acts	*320*
State and private forestry cooperation	*65, 959*
Cooperative range improvements	*1, 159*
Flood control	*152, 465*
Soil Conservation Service	*803, 009*
Water conservation and utilization projects	*6, 919*
Production and Marketing Administration:	
Conservation and use of agricultural land resources	*400, 620*
Agricultural production programs	*335, 138*
Sugar Act program	*93, 941*
National school-lunch program	*132, 509*
Marketing services	*248, 135*

INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS—Continued

Sec. 410: Limitation on filling positions—Con.

Commodity Exchange Authority	*$58, 928*
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation	*250, 089*
Rural Electrification Administration: Salaries and expenses	*455, 602*
Farmers' Home Administration: Salaries and expenses	*982, 300*
Farm Credit Administration (direct appropriation)	*46, 641*
Extension Service:	
Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico	*20, 255*
Salaries and expenses	*68, 827*
Office of the Secretary	*199, 082*
Office of the Solicitor	*231, 010*
Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations	*51, 946*
Office of Information	*55, 732*
Library	*58, 763*
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities (permanent appropriation—administrative expenses)	*325, 453*

Provided, That nothing in the foregoing shall be construed to effect greater reductions than have been made in the individual appropriation paragraphs in this Act: Provided further, That not to exceed $3,047,079 of the funds appropriated under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, shall be available in the current fiscal year for personal services in the Department of Agriculture in carrying out the purposes of such Act, as amended, including marketing agreements and orders.

Sec. 410: Ratio of personnel employees to total personnel served.

The committee recommends that the following be inserted in the bill:

No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred and fifteen, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the Department and its instrumentalities, cooperators and collaborators receiving personnel services from the Department: Provided, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half-time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting: Provided further, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed as permitting any increase whatever in personnel officers over and above the number otherwise provided for in this Act.

Decreases and Limitations

Bureau of Agricultural Economics:

Crop and livestock estimates $1,696

The decrease recommended by the committee is the further reduction required by the amendment providing for reductions, with exceptions as stated, of 10 percent in the estimates for personal services. In this item, the reduction has been applied to general administrative functions only. The total amount provided is $2,848,304, which is $17,696 below the budget estimate.

Agricultural Research Administration:

Office of Administrator 18,560

The decrease recommended by the committee is the further reduction required by the amendment providing for reductions, with exceptions as stated, of 10 percent in the estimates for personal services. The total amount provided is $541,440, which is $45,560 below the budget estimate.

The committee also recommends that the following be inserted in the bill:

except for the alteration of one building at Greenfield, Massachusetts, at a cost not to exceed $7,500.

Office of Experiment Stations:

Salaries and expenses 22,910

The decrease recommended by the committee is the further reduction required by the amendment providing for reductions, with exceptions as stated, of 10 percent in the estimates for personal services. The total amount provided is $367,090, which is $32,910 below the budget estimate.

Bureau of Animal Industry:

Animal disease control and eradication 18,978

The decrease recommended by the committee is the net result of the reduction of the $68,978 required by the amendment providing for 10 percent reduction for personal services, with exceptions as stated, and an increase of $50,000 recommended by the committee for sheep scabies eradication. The total amount provided is $7,731,022, which is $136,978 below the budget estimate.

Marketing agreements, hog cholera virus and serum 1,394

The decrease recommended by the committee is the further reduction required by the amendment providing for reductions, with exceptions as stated, of 10 percent from the personal service estimates. The total amount provided is $47,906, which is $1,394 below the budget estimate.

National Arboretum 11,680

The decrease recommended by the committee is the further reduction required by the amendment providing for reductions, with exceptions as stated, of 10 percent from the personal service estimates. The total amount provided is $136,920, which is $11,680 below the budget estimate.

Total decrease, Agricultural Research Administration 73,522

Decreases and Limitations—Continued

Forest Service:

Forest Research $111,897

The decrease recommended by the committee is the net result of the reduction of the $154,397 required by the amendment providing for 10 percent reduction for personal services, with exceptions as stated, and the restoration of the $42,500 for establishing an experimental research center in northern New Mexico and to strengthen the work in Puerto Rico. The total amount provided is $5,108,603, which is $236,397 below the budget estimate.

Acquisition of lands for national forests:

Special acts 320

The decrease recommended by the committee is the further reduction required by the amendment providing for reductions, with exceptions as stated, of 10 percent from the personal services estimates. The total amount provided is $141,680, which is $320 below the budget estimate.

Total decrease, Forest Service 112,217

Soil Conservation Service:

Salaries and expenses 803,009

The decrease recommended by the committee is the further reduction required by the amendment providing for reductions, with exceptions as stated, of 10 percent from the personal services estimates. The total amount provided is $53,474,991, which is $803,009 below the budget estimate.

The committee also recommends that the following be deleted from the bill:

> and water regulation to conserve the soil and reduce fire hazards in the Everglades region of Florida, except that expenditures for all work in the Everglades region shall be limited to a sum not in excess of funds made available for such work by the State of Florida, or political subdivisions thereof

The bill does not provide additional funds for technical assistance to new soil conservation districts, but the committee hopes that the Soil Conservation Service will be able to distribute its technical personnel to furnish to all districts as much assistance as possible within the total funds available. The committee does not believe that it would be advisable to divert from research and from the management and development of land utilization projects funds to furnish assistance to the new districts, since it is advised that funds available for such purposes are already at a minimum.

Production and Marketing Administration:

National school lunch program 132,509

The decrease recommended by the committee is the further reduction required by the amendment providing for reductions, with exceptions as stated, of 10 percent from the personal services estimates. The total amount provided is $83,367,491, which is $132,509 below the budget estimate.

DECREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

Commodity Exchange Authority	$58,928

The decrease recommended by the committee is the further reduction required by the amendment providing for reductions, with exceptions as stated, of 10 percent from the personal service estimates. The total amount provided is $591,072, which is $58,928 below the budget estimate.

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation	50,089

The decrease recommended by the committee is the further reduction required by the amendment providing for reductions, with exceptions as stated, of 10 percent from the personal services estimates. The total amount provided is $7,949,911, which is $250,089 below the budget estimate.

Extension Service:

Salaries and expenses	61,327

The decrease recommended by the committee is the further reduction required by the amendment providing for reductions, with exceptions as stated, of 10 percent from the personal services estimates. The total amount provided is $818,673, which is $68,827 below the budget estimate.

Office of the Secretary	90,032

The decrease recommended by the committee is the further reduction required by the amendment providing for reductions, with exceptions as stated, of 10 percent from the personal services estimates. The total amount provided is $1,992,168, which is $199,082 below the budget estimate.

Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations	51,946

The decrease recommended by the committee is the further reduction required by the amendment providing for reductions, with exceptions as stated, of 10 percent from the personal services estimates. The total amount provided is $548,054, which is $51,946 below the budget estimate.

Office of Information	55,732

The decrease recommended by the committee is the further reduction required by the amendment providing for reductions, with exceptions as stated, of 10 percent from the personal services estimates. The total amount provided is $1,215,268, which is $55,732 below the budget estimate.

Library	58,763

The decrease recommended by the committee is the further reduction required by the amendment providing for reductions, with exceptions as stated, of 10 percent from the personal services estimates. The total amount provided is $641,237, which is $58,763 below the budget estimate.

Total decreases	1,549,770
Total increases	36,024,667
Less total decreases	1,549,770
Net increase	34,474,897
Amount of bill as reported to Senate	751,770,130

PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951	Estimates, 1952	Increase or decrease
Payments to school funds, Arizona and New Mexico	$71,930	$71,930	
Expenses and refunds, brush disposal	1,400,000	1,400,000	
Payments to Minnesota, national forest fund	45,000	45,000	
Payments to States and Territories, national forest fund	8,372,747	10,354,017	+$1,981,270
Roads and trails for States, national forest fund	3,350,379	4,141,607	+791,228
Payments due counties and refunds, submarginal land program	240,000	240,000	
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities	111,192,249	[1] 150,000,000	+38,807,751
Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act fund	300,000	350,000	+50,000
Cooperative agricultural extension work	4,704,710	4,704,710	
Replacement of personal property sold	855,000	870,000	+15,000
Net total, permanent appropriation	130,532,015	172,177,264	+41,645,249

[1] Includes $76,808,000 proposed in budget for transfer to International Wheat Agreement.

TRUST FUNDS

[Not a charge against revenues]

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951	Estimates, 1952	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Animal Industry: Expenses and refunds, inspection and certification of canned wet animal foods	$100,000	$100,000	
Forest Service:			
Cooperative work	4,500,000	4,500,000	
State rural rehabilitation corporation funds	13,651	13,651	
Soil Conservation Service:			
Operation and maintenance, water distribution systems, water conservation and utilization projects	9,800	9,800	
Payments in lieu of taxes and operation and maintenance costs, water conservation and utilization projects	26,000	19,000	−$7,000
Technical services and other assistance, agricultural conservation program	200,000	200,000	
Production and Marketing Administration:			
Expenses and refunds, inspection and grading of farm products	5,706,700	5,800,000	+93,300
Indemnity fund, county associations	500	500	
Undistributed cotton price adjustment payments	100	100	
Farmers Home Administration:			
Liquidation of deposits, lease, and purchase contracts	16,000	14,000	−2,000
State rural rehabilitation funds and new agreements	9,800,000	7,000,000	−2,800,000
Miscellaneous contributed funds	589,450	533,000	−56,450
Return of excess deposits for reduction of photographs, mosaics, and maps	46,360	200	−46,160
Total, trust funds	21,008,561	18,190,251	−2,818,310

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

(TITLE III)

Agency and item	Authorizations, 1951	Estimates, 1952	Recommended in House bill for 1952	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−) Senate bill compared with—		
					Authorizations, 1951	Estimates, 1952	House bill
Commodity Credit Corporation	[1] $19,100,000	$20,200,000	$15,000,000	$16,500,000	−$2,600,000	−$3,700,000	+$1,500,000
FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION							
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	1,280,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	−180,000		
Federal Intermediate Credit Banks	1,496,000	1,496,000	1,496,000	1,496,000			
Production Credit Corporations	1,358,000	1,358,000	1,358,000	1,358,000			
Total, administrative expense limitations	23,234,000	24,154,000	18,954,000	20,454,000	−2,780,000	−3,700,000	+1,500,000

[1] Includes $2,750,000 appropriated in Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.

LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS

(TITLE I)

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951		Estimates, 1952	Recommended in House bill for 1952	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−) Senate bill compared with—		
	Specific amounts	As reduced under sec. 1214				Appropriations, 1951, as reduced under sec. 1214	Estimates, 1952	House bill
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION								
Farm ownership and farm housing	[1] $65,000,000	[1] $40,500,000	$38,000,000	$38,000,000	$38,000,000	−$2,500,000		
Production and subsistence	[2] 103,000,000	[2] 103,000,000	110,000,000	100,000,000	110,000,000	+7,000,000		+$10,000,000
Water facilities	4,000,000	4,000,000	5,000,000	4,250,000	5,000,000	+1,000,000		+750,000
Total, Farmers Home Administration	172,000,000	147,500,000	153,000,000	142,250,000	153,000,000	+5,500,000		+10,750,000
RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION								
Rural electrification [3]	350,000,000	264,500,000	100,000,000	[5] 100,000,000	[6] 100,000,000	−164,500,000		
Rural telephone [4]	32,500,000	32,500,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	[7] 9,000,000	−23,500,000		
Total, Rural Electrification Administration	382,500,000	297,000,000	109,000,000	109,000,000	109,000,000	−188,000,000		
Total, loan authorizations	554,500,000	444,500,000	262,000,000	251,250,000	262,000,000	−182,500,000		+10,750,000

[1] In addition prior year balance of $7,134,975 available.
[2] Includes $18,000,000 authorized in Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.
[3] Due to carry-over of funds from prior years, a loan program of $284,000,000 is planned for 1951 and $220,000,000 for 1952.
[4] Due to carry-over of funds from prior years, a loan program of $40,000,000 is planned for 1951 and 23,073,500 for 1952.
[5] In addition, a contingent borrowing authorization of $100,000,000 was provided in lieu of language proposed in the budget to waive application of State allotment formula
[6] In addition, a contingent borrowing authorization of $75,000,000 is proposed.
[7] In addition, a contingent borrowing authorization of $25,000,000 is proposed.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1951, AMOUNTS AS REDUCED UNDER SEC. 1214 (GENERAL REDUCTION OF $550,000,000 IN GENERAL APPROPRIATION ACT, 1951), ESTIMATES FOR 1952, AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1952

TITLE I—REGULAR ACTIVITIES

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951		Estimates, 1952	Recommended in House bill for 1952	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−) Senate bill compared with—		
	Specific amounts	As reduced under sec. 1214				Appropriations 1951 as reduced under sec. 1214	Estimates, 1952	House bill
Research and Marketing Act of 1946	$6,000,000	$5,932,000	$5,500,000	$4,700,000	$4,850,000	−$1,082,000	−$650,000	+$150,000
BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS								
Economic investigations	[1] 2,621,000	[1] 2,556,000	2,529,000	2,000,000	2,250,000	−306,000	−279,000	+250,000
Crop and livestock estimates	[2] 2,922,400	[2] 2,922,400	2,866,000	2,850,000	2,848,304	−74,096	−17,696	−1,696
Total, Bureau of Agricultural Economics	5,543,400	5,478,400	5,395,000	4,850,000	5,098,304	−380,096	−296,696	+248,304
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION								
Office of Administrator	592,500	587,500	587,000	560,000	541,440	−46,060	−45,560	−18,560
Working capital fund, Agricultural Research Center	300,000	300,000	----------	----------	----------	−300,000	----------	----------
Research on agricultural problems of Alaska	280,000	280,000	280,000	250,000	261,550	−18,450	−18,450	+11,550
Office of Experiment Stations:								
Payments to States, etc.	12,416,208	12,416,208	12,453,708	12,416,208	12,431,208	+15,000	−22,500	+15,000
Salaries and expenses	412,500	407,500	400,000	390,000	367,090	−40,410	−32,910	−22,910
Total, Office of Experiment Stations	12,828,708	12,823,708	12,853,708	12,806,208	12,798,298	−25,410	−55,410	−7,910
Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics	1,498,100	1,483,100	1,482,500	1,350,000	1,350,000	−133,100	−132,500	----------

Bureau of Animal Industry:								
Salaries and expenses:								
Animal research	3,617,200	3,528,200	3,539,400	3,200,700	3,320,700	−207,500	−218,700	+120,000
Animal disease control and eradication	7,949,300	7,907,300	7,868,000	7,750,000	7,731,022	−176,278	−136,978	−18,978
Marketing agreements, hog cholera virus and serum	----------	----------	49,300	49,300	47,906	+47,906	−1,394	−1,394
Meat inspection	12,799,600	12,799,600	13,393,300	12,800,000	12,800,000	+400	−593,300	----------
Total, Bureau of Animal Industry	24,366,100	24,235,100	24,850,000	23,800,000	23,899,628	−335,472	−950,372	+99,628
Bureau of Dairy Industry	1,617,000	1,589,500	1,589,000	1,450,000	1,491,000	−98,500	−98,000	+41,000
Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry	8,100,000	7,970,000	7,967,000	7,200,000	7,300,000	−670,000	−667,000	+100,000
Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils and Agricultural Engineering:								
Plant, soil, and agricultural engineering research	[3] 10,915,600	[3] 10,695,350	10,636,400	10,351,400	10,589,730	−105,620	−46,670	+238,330
National Arboretum	152,700	148,650	148,600	148,600	136,920	−11,730	−11,680	−11,680
Total, Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils and Agricultural Engineering	11,068,300	10,844,000	10,785,000	10,500,000	10,726,650	−117,350	−58,350	+226,650
Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine: Salaries and expenses:								
Insect investigations	4,106,800	4,061,300	3,908,000	3,525,000	3,797,725	−263,575	−110,275	+272,725
Insect and plant disease control	4,938,500	4,834,500	4,760,000	4,500,000	4,716,062	−118,438	−43,938	+216,062
Plant quarantines	2,426,200	2,388,500	2,667,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	+211,500	−67,000	----------
Total salaries and expenses	11,471,500	11,284,300	11,335,000	10,625,000	11,113,787	−170,513	−221,213	+488,787
Control of emergency outbreaks of insect and plant diseases	[4] 2,545,760	[4] 2,545,760	2,063,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	−745,760	−263,000	----------
Total, Bureau of Entolomology and Plant Quarantine	14,017,260	13,830,060	13,398,000	12,425,000	12,913,787	−916,273	−484,213	+488,787
Total, Agricultural Research Administration	74,667,968	73,942,968	73,792,208	70,341,208	71,282,353	−2,660,615	−2,509,855	+941,145

[1] Includes $21,000 allocated from "Expenses of defense production, 1951."
[2] Includes $18,400 allocated from "Expenses of defense production, 1951."
[3] Includes $100,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.
[4] Includes carry-over of $445,760 from fiscal year 1950.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951, amounts as reduced under sec. 1214 (general reduction of $550,000,000 in General Appropriation Act, 1951), estimates for 1952, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1952—Continued

TITLE I—REGULAR ACTIVITIES—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951		Estimates, 1952	Recommended in House bill for 1952	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−) Senate bill compared with—		
	Specific amounts	As reduced under sec. 1214				Appropriations 1951 as reduced under sec. 1214	Estimates, 1952	House bill
CONTROL OF FOREST PESTS								
Forest Pest Control Act	[5] $3,729,458	[5] $3,729,458	$5,743,000	$1,700,000	$3,600,000	−$129,458	−$2,143,000	+$1,900,000
White pine blister rust	3,489,750	3,429,000	3,407,000	3,300,000	3,300,000	−129,000	−107,000	
Total, control of forest pests	7,219,208	7,158,458	9,150,000	5,000,000	6,900,000	−258,458	−2,250,000	+1,900,000
FOREST SERVICE								
Salaries and expenses:								
National forest protection and management	[6] 27,555,025	[6] 27,222,025	29,655,000	27,122,025	27,522,025	+300,000	−2,132,975	+400,000
Fighting forest fires	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000			
Forest research	5,317,500	5,220,500	5,345,000	5,220,500	5,108,603	−111,897	−236,397	−111,897
Total, salaries and expenses	38,872,525	38,442,525	41,000,000	38,342,525	38,630,628	+188,103	−2,369,372	+288,103
Forest development roads and trails	[7] 14,884,138	[7] 14,884,138	17,500,000	11,500,000	14,500,000	−384,138	−3,000,000	+3,000,000
Acquisition of lands for national forests:								
Weeks Act	300,000	250,000	100,000	50,000	100,000	−150,000		+50,000
Superior National Forest	150,000	150,000	150,000	100,000	150,000			+50,000
Special acts	142,000	142,000	142,000	142,000	141,680	−320	−320	−320
State and private forestry cooperation	10,867,800	10,832,800	10,820,000	10,750,000	10,750,000	−82,800	−70,000	

Cooperative range improvements	700,000	700,000	750,000	----------	700,000	----------	−50,000	+700,000
Total, Forest Service	65,916,463	65,401,463	70,462,000	60,884,525	64,972,308	−429,155	−5,489,692	+4,087,783
Flood control	[8] 13,401,575	[8] 9,201,575	8,900,000	6,112,800	6,372,800	−2,828,775	−2,527,200	+260,000
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE								
Salaries and expenses	55,460,632	54,940,632	54,278,000	54,278,000	53,474,991	−1,465,641	−803,009	−803,009
Water conservation and utilization projects	[9] 841,286	[9] 526,786	500,000	185,500	285,500	−241,286	−214,500	+100,000
Total, Soil Conservation Service	56,301,918	55,467,418	54,778,000	54,463,500	53,760,491	−1,706,927	−1,017,509	−703,009
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION								
Conservation and use of agricultural land resources	[10] 308,250,000	[10] 282,250,000	285,000,000	256,500,000	280,000,000	−2,250,000	−5,000,000	+23,500,000
Agricultural production programs [11]	[12] 36,395,500	[12] 29,895,500	20,000,000	8,300,000	12,000,000	−17,895,500	−8,000,000	+3,700,000
Sugar Act	63,750,000	63,750,000	73,300,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	+6,250,000	−3,300,000	----------
National school lunch	83,500,000	83,500,000	83,500,000	83,500,000	83,367,491	−132,509	−132,509	−132,509
Marketing services	10,838,000	10,828,000	11,396,000	10,800,000	10,800,000	−28,000	−596,000	----------
Total, Production and Marketing Administration	502,733,500	470,223,500	473,196,000	429,100,000	456,167,491	−14,056,009	−17,028,509	+27,067,491
Commodity Exchange Authority	650,000	650,000	650,000	650,000	591,072	−58,928	−58,928	−58,928
Federal Crop Insurance (administrative expenses)	7,203,625	7,095,625	8,200,000	8,000,000	7,949,911	+854,286	−250,089	−50,089
Rural Electrification Administration (salaries and expenses)	8,549,600	8,421,350	8,500,000	7,750,000	7,750,000	−671,350	−750,000	----------
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION								
Grants	650,000	400,000	200,000	----------	----------	−400,000	−200,000	----------
Salaries and expenses	28,499,752	28,199,752	29,700,000	27,500,000	28,150,000	−49,752	−1,550,000	+650,000
Total, Farmers Home Administration	29,149,752	28,599,752	29,900,000	27,500,000	28,150,000	−449,752	−1,750,000	+650,000

[5] Includes carry-over of $2,079,458 from fiscal year 1950.
[6] Includes $100,000 allocated from "Expenses of defense production, 1951."
[7] Includes carry-over of $1,146,638 from fiscal year 1950, and $3,300,000 appropriated in third supplemental appropriation act, 1951.
[8] Includes carry-over of $3,088.775 from fiscal year 1950.
[9] Includes carry-over of $341,286 from fiscal year 1950.
[10] Includes accumulated reserve of $25,750,000 available from prior-year operations.
[11] Formerly designated as "Acreage allotments and marketing quotas."
[12] Includes $4,095,500 allocated from "Expenses of defense production, 1951."

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951, amounts as reduced under sec. 1214 (general reduction of $550,000,000 in General Appropriation Act, 1951), estimates for 1952, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1952—Continued

TITLE I—REGULAR ACTIVITIES—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951		Estimates, 1952	Recommended in House bill for 1952	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−) Senate bill compared with—		
	Specific amounts	As reduced under sec. 1214				Appropriations 1951 as reduced under sec. 1214	Estimates, 1952	House bill
FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION								
Direct appropriation	$584,700	$579,700	$580,000	$300,000	$400,000	−$179,700	−$180,000	+$100,000
Assessments against member institutions	2,325,000	2,325,000	2,325,000	2,325,000	2,325,000			
Total, Farm Credit Administration	2,909,700	2,904,700	2,905,000	2,625,000	2,725,000	−179,700	−180,000	+100,000
EXTENSION SERVICE								
Payments to States, etc	27,103,498	27,103,498	27,164,588	27,135,000	27,135,000	+31,502	−29,588	
Salaries and expenses	897,500	888,500	887,500	880,000	818,673	−69,827	−68,827	−61,327
Total, Extension Service	28,000,998	27,991,998	28,052,088	28,015,000	27,953,673	−38,325	−98,415	−61,327
Office of the Secretary	[13] 2,181,800	[13] 2,157,200	2,191,250	2,082,200	1,992,168	−165,032	−199,082	−90,032
Office of Solicitor	[14] 2,590,500	[14] 2,552,100	2,463,000	2,200,000	2,200,000	−352,100	−263,000	
Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations	[15] 645,000	[15] 645,000	600,000	600,000	548,054	−96,946	−51,946	−51,946
Office of Information	[16] 1,288,900	[16] 1,274,600	1,271,000	1,271,000	1,215,268	−59,332	−55,732	−55,732
Library	713,293	702,593	700,000	700,000	641,237	−61,356	−58,763	−58,763
Total, title I	815,667,200	775,800,700	786,605,546	716,845,233	751,120,130	−24,680,570	−35,485,416	+34,274,897

[13] Includes $13,000 allocated from "Expenses of defense production, 1951."
[14] Includes $28,000 allocated from "Expenses of defense production, 1951."
[15] Includes $45,000 allocated from "Expenses of defense production, 1951."
[16] Includes $4,100 allocated from "Expenses of defense production, 1951."

TITLE II—SPECIAL ACTIVITIES

Research on strategic and critical materials	$399,000	$399,000	[17] $900,000	$450,000	$650,000	+$251,000	−$250,000	+$200,000
Eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals	----------	----------	32,700,000	([18])	([18])	----------	−32,700,000	----------
International Wheat Agreement	----------	----------	(76,808,000)	----------	----------	----------	(−76,808,000)	----------
Total, title II	399,000	399,000	33,600,000	450,000	650,000	+251,000	−32,950,000	+200,000
Total, direct annual appropriations	816,066,200	776,199,700	820,205,546	717,295,233	751,770,130	−24,429,570	−68,435,416	+34,474,897

[17] Includes budget amendment of $200,000 proposed in S. Doc. 45.
[18] Provides for note cancellation in lieu of direct appropriation as proposed in budget.

○

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

[Report No. 561]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 21 (legislative day, MAY 17), 1951

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JULY 21, 1951

Reported, under authority of the order of the Senate of July 20 (legislative day, June 27), 1951, by Mr. RUSSELL, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-
5 ment of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952,
6 namely:

7 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

8 TITLE I—REGULAR ACTIVITIES

9 RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946

10 To enable the Secretary to improve and develop, in-
11 dependently or through cooperation among Federal and

1 State agencies, and others, a sound and efficient system for
2 the distribution and marketing of agricultural products under
3 the provisions of titles II and III of the Act of August
4 14, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1621–1629), ~~$4,700,000~~
5 *$4,850,000*: *Provided,* That not less than $600,000 of this
6 amount shall be available for contracts in accordance with
7 the provisions of section 205 of said Act: *Provided further,*
8 That the Secretary may make available to any bureau,
9 office, or agency of the Department such amounts
10 from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry
11 out the functions for which it is made (but amounts
12 made available to the Office of the Secretary, Office of the
13 Solicitor, and Office of Information, shall not exceed those
14 which the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon
15 with representatives of the Department, shall determine),
16 and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts trans-
17 ferred or otherwise made available to other appropriation
18 items of the Department: *Provided further,* That no part
19 of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to
20 fish or shellfish or any product thereof, except for the sup-
21 port of equitable transportation rates before Federal agen-
22 cies concerned with such rates and for development of foreign
23 markets.

1 BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

2 For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of
3 the Act establishing the Bureau of Agricultural Economics
4 (7 U. S. C. 411) and related Acts, as follows:

5 Economic investigations: For conducting investigations
6 and for acquiring and diffusing useful information among the
7 people of the United States, relative to agricultural pro-
8 duction, distribution, land utilization, and conservation in
9 their broadest aspects, including farm management and prac-
10 tice, utilization of farm and food products, purchasing of farm
11 supplies, farm population and rural life, farm labor, farm
12 finance, insurance and taxation, adjustments in production
13 to probable demand for the different farm and food products;
14 land ownership and values, costs, prices and income in their
15 relation to agriculture, including causes for their variations
16 and trends, ~~$2,000,000~~ *$2,250,000*: *Provided,* That no part
17 of the funds herein appropriated or made available to the
18 Bureau of Agricultural Economics under the heading "Eco-
19 nomic investigations" shall be used for State and county land-
20 use planning, for conducting cultural surveys, or for the
21 maintenance of regional offices.

22 Crop and livestock estimates: For collecting, compiling,
23 abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and pub-

1 lishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and live-
2 stock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, staples of cotton,
3 stocks, and value of farm crops and numbers, grades, and
4 value of livestock and livestock products on farms, pro-
5 duction, distribution, and consumption of turpentine and
6 rosin pursuant to the Act of August 15, 1935 (5 U. S. C.
7 556b), and for the collection and publication of statistics
8 of peanuts as provided by the Act approved June 24, 1936,
9 as amended May 12, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 951–957),
10 ~~$2,850,000~~ *$2,848,304*: *Provided,* That no part of the funds
11 herein appropriated shall be available for any expense inci-
12 dent to ascertaining, collating, or publishing a report stating
13 the intention of farmers as to the acreage to be planted in
14 cotton, or for estimates of apple production for other than the
15 commercial crop.

16 AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

17 OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

18 For necessary expenses of the Office of Administrator,
19 including travel and subsistence expenses of advisory com-
20 mittees authorized by title III of the Act of August 14, 1946
21 (7 U. S. C. 1628–1629), and the maintenance, operation,
22 and furnishing of facilities and services at the Agricultural
23 Research Center, ~~$560,000~~ *$541,440*: *Provided,* That the
24 appropriation current at the time services are rendered may
25 be reimbursed (by advance credits or reimbursements

1 based on estimated or actual charges) from applicable appro-
2 priations, to cover the charges, including handling and other
3 related services, for equipment rentals (including depre-
4 ciation, maintenance, and repairs); for services, supplies,
5 equipment, and material furnished: *Provided further,* That
6 of the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research
7 Administration, not to exceed $15,000 shall be available
8 for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section
9 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as
10 amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
11 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further,* That the several appro-
12 priations of the Agricultural Research Administration shall
13 be available for the construction, alteration, and repair of
14 buildings and improvements: *Provided, however,* That unless
15 otherwise provided, the cost of constructing any one build-
16 ing (excepting headhouses connecting greenhouses and
17 experimental farm houses) shall not exceed $5,000, the
18 total amount for construction of buildings costing more
19 than $2,500 each shall be within the limits of the esti-
20 mates submitted and approved therefor, and the cost of
21 altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not
22 exceed $2,500 or 2 per centum of the cost of the building
23 as certified by the Research Administrator, whichever is
24 greater, *except for the alteration of one building at Greenfield,*
25 *Massachusetts, at a cost not to exceed $7,500: Provided*

1 *further,* That not to exceed 7 per centum of the funds of
2 any research appropriation of the Agricultural Research Ad-
3 ministration, including the appropriation for the Office of the
4 Administrator, may be transferred by the Administrator,
5 with the approval of the Secretary, to any other such re-
6 search appropriation in order to provide for a more effective
7 research program: *Provided, however,* That no appropria-
8 tion may be increased more than 7 per centum by such
9 transfers.

10 RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA

11 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to con-
12 duct research into the basic agricultural needs and problems
13 of the Territory of Alaska, through such agencies of the De-
14 partment as he may designate, independently or in coopera-
15 tion with appropriate agencies of the Territory of Alaska,
16 ~~$250,000~~ *$261,550.*

17 OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

18 Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico

19 For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto
20 Rico to be paid quarterly in advance where applicable, to
21 carry into effect the provisions of the following Acts relating
22 to agricultural experiment stations:

23 Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related
24 Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7
25 U. S. C. 362, 363, 365, 368, 377–379), $720,000; Adams

1 Act, the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369),
2 $720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24,
3 1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373–376, 380, 382),
4 $2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act ap-
5 proved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), sections 3
6 and 5, $2,863,708, and sections 9 and 11 of said Act as
7 added by the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427h,
8 427j), including administration by the Office of Experi-
9 ment Stations in the United States Department of Agri-
10 culture, $5,000,000, no part of which latter amount shall
11 be used for beginning construction of any building costing
12 in excess of $15,000, except that a poultry breeding house
13 may be constructed at Purdue University at a cost to this
14 appropriation of not to exceed $29,000; Hawaii, the Act
15 approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386–386b), extending
16 the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to the Territory of
17 Hawaii, $90,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23,
18 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Hatch
19 Act to the Territory of Alaska, $15,000, and the provisions
20 of section 2 of the Act approved June 20, 1936, as amended
21 (7 U. S. C. 369a, Public Law 739, approved August 29,
22 1950), extending the benefits of the Adams and Purnell
23 Acts to the Territory of Alaska, ~~$37,500~~ *$52,500*; Puerto
24 Rico, the Act approved March 4, 1931, as amended (7
25 U. S. C. 386d–386f), extending the benefits of certain Acts

1 of Congress to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments to
2 States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, ~~$12,416,208~~
3 *$12,431,208.*

4 Salaries and Expenses

5 For necessary expenses in connection with administra-
6 tion of grants and coordination of research with States pur-
7 suant to the Acts approved March 2, 1887, March 16, 1906,
8 February 24, 1925, May 16, 1928, February 23, 1929,
9 March 4, 1931, and June 20, 1936, and Acts amendatory
10 thereto (7 U. S. C. 361–363, 365–383, 386–386f), and
11 title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended by
12 the Act of September 21, 1944 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g),
13 and for the administration, operation, and maintenance of
14 an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, ~~$390,000~~
15 *$367,090*; and the Secretary shall prescribe the form of the
16 annual financial statement required under the above Acts,
17 ascertain whether the expenditures are in accordance with
18 their provisions, coordinate the research work of the State
19 agricultural colleges and experiment stations in the lines
20 authorized in said Acts with research of the Department in
21 similar lines, and make report thereon to Congress.

22 BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

23 For necessary expenses in connection with conducting
24 investigations of the relative utility and economy of agri-
25 cultural products for food, clothing, and other uses in the

1 home, with special suggestions of plans and methods for
2 the more effective utilization of such products for these
3 purposes, and such economic investigations, including
4 housing and household buying, as have for their purpose
5 the improvement of the rural home, for coordinating nutri-
6 tion services made available by Federal, State, and other
7 agencies, and for disseminating useful information on these
8 subjects, $1,350,000.

9 BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

10 Salaries and Expenses

11 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
12 the Act, as amended, establishing a Bureau of Animal
13 Industry, and related Acts, and for investigation concerned
14 with the livestock and meat industries and the domestic
15 raising of fur-bearing animals, as follows:

16 Animal research: For animal husbandry investigations;
17 investigations of diseases of animals and of tuberculin,
18 serums, antitoxins, and analogous products; and cooperation
19 in the administration of regulations for the improvement of
20 poultry, poultry products, and hatcheries, as authorized by
21 law (7 U. S. C. 429, Public Law 662, approved August 4,
22 1950); ~~$3,200,700~~ *$3,320,700.*

23 Animal disease control and eradication: For the control
24 and eradication of tuberculosis and paratuberculosis of ani-

1 mals, avian turberculosis, Bang's disease of cattle, scabies
2 in sheep and cattle, southern cattle ticks, hog cholera and
3 related swine diseases, and dourine in horses, and other
4 inspection and quarantine work authorized by law; for
5 supervision of the transportation of livestock, including
6 administration of the twenty-eight-hour law; for inspection
7 of vessels; and for carrying out the provisions of the Act
8 of March 4, 1913 (21 U. S. C. 151–158), relating to
9 veterinary biological products, ~~$7,750,000~~ *$7,731,022*, in-
10 cluding $30,000 for the acquisition of land and construction
11 of buildings for inspection of livestock at Canadian border
12 ports of entry: *Provided,* That no payment hereunder as
13 compensation for any cattle condemned for slaughter for
14 tuberculosis, paratuberculosis, or Bang's disease shall exceed
15 (1) $25 for any grade animal or $50 for any pure bred
16 animal, (2) one-third of the difference between the appraised
17 value and the value of salvage thereof, or (3) the amount paid
18 or to be paid by the State or other cooperating agency,
19 and no payment hereunder shall be made for any animal
20 if at the time of test or condemnation it shall belong
21 to or be upon the premises of any person, firm, or corpora-
22 tion to which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered for
23 slaughter.

24 Marketing agreements, hog cholera virus and serum:
25 For carrying into effect sections 56 to 60, inclusive, of the

1 Act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 851–855)
2 regulating the marketing of anti-hog-cholera serum and hog-
3 cholera virus, ~~$49,300~~ *$47,906*.

4 Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of
5 laws relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat-food
6 products, including the purchase of one passenger motor
7 vehicle for replacement only, $12,800,000: *Provided*, That
8 hereafter reimbursement may be made by any person, firm,
9 or organization for the expenses of meat inspection in excess
10 of those which can be met from the amount appropriated
11 for such purpose of each year.

12 BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

13 For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions
14 of the Act of May 29, 1924 (7 U. S. C. 401–404), includ-
15 ing investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in dairy
16 industry, the applicable provisions of the Act of May 9,
17 1902 (26 U. S. C. 2325, 2326 (c)), relating to process
18 or renovated butter, as amended, and the Act of May 23,
19 1908 (21 U. S. C. 94 (a)), insofar as it relates to the
20 exportation of process or renovated butter, ~~$1,150,000~~
21 *$1,491,000*.

22 BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

23 For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments,
24 and demonstrations established under the provisions of sec-
25 tion 202 (a) to 202 (e), inclusive, of title II of the Agri-

1 cultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1292); for the
2 development of new and extended food, feed, and industrial
3 uses for agricultural commodities, both plant and animal,
4 and potential replacement crops, and processing, biological,
5 chemical, physical, pharmacological, toxicological, and tech-
6 nological investigation thereof, ~~$7,200,000~~ *$7,300,000.*

7 BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL
8 ENGINEERING

9 Plant, soil, and agricultural engineering research: For
10 expenses necessary for investigations, experiments, and dem-
11 onstrations concerning plants, soils, and agricultural engi-
12 neering, including those related to the production, improve-
13 ment, handling, processing, transportation, and storage of
14 farm and other crops; control of weeds, plant diseases, and
15 nematodes; discovery and introduction of new and useful
16 plants, both foreign and native; soil and water management
17 to improve soil productivity; the relation of soils to plant,
18 animal, and human nutrition; classification and mapping of
19 soils; fertilizers, liming materials, and soil amendments;
20 farm machinery and processing equipment; farm buildings,
21 and farm electrification; and for the operation and mainte-
22 nance of airplanes; ~~$10,351,400~~ *$10,589,730, including not*
23 *to exceed $275,000 for the construction of a laboratory at*
24 *Orlando, Florida.*

25 National Arboretum: For the maintenance and develop-

1 ment of the National Arboretum established under the pro-
2 visions of the Act approved March 4, 1927 (20 U. S. C.
3 191–194, ~~$148,600~~ *$136,920.*

4 BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

5 Salaries and Expenses

6 For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments,
7 demonstrations, and surveys for the promotion of economic
8 entomology, for investigating and ascertaining the best
9 means of destroying insects and related pests injurious to
10 agriculture, for importing useful and beneficial insects and
11 bacterial, fungal, and other diseases of insects and related
12 pests, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of
13 destroying insects affecting man and animals, and the best
14 ways of utilizing beneficial insects, for carrying into effect
15 the provisions of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20,
16 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), the Honey Bee
17 Act (7 U. S. C. 281–283), the Insect Pest Act (7 U. S. C.
18 141–144), the Mexican Border Act (7 U. S. C. 149), and
19 the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), as amended,
20 authorizing the eradication, control, and prevention of spread
21 of injurious insects and plant pests; including the operation
22 and maintenance of airplanes and the purchase of not to
23 exceed two, as follows:

24 Insect investigations: For the investigation of insects
25 affecting fruits, grapes, nuts, trees, shrubs, forests and forest

1 products, truck and garden crops, cereal, forage and range
2 crops, cotton, tobacco, sugar plants, ornamental and other
3 plants and agricultural products, household possessions, and
4 man and animals; for bee culture and apiary management;
5 for classifying, identifying, and collecting information to de-
6 termine the distribution and abundance of insects; for inves-
7 tigations in connection with introduction of natural enemies
8 of injurious insects and related pests and for the exchange
9 with other countries of useful and beneficial insects and other
10 arthropods; for developing methods, equipment, and appa-
11 ratus to aid in enforcing plant quarantines and in the eradica-
12 tion and control of insect pests and plant diseases; and for
13 investigations of insecticides and fungicides, including meth-
14 ods of their manufacture and use and the effects of their
15 application, ~~$3,525,000~~ *$3,797,725*: *Provided,* That of the
16 amount allotted for oriental fruitfly, not to exceed $250,000
17 may be used for contracts with public or private agencies for
18 research in accordance with section 10 (a) of the Act of
19 August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427i), and the amounts
20 obligated for contract research shall remain available until
21 expended.

22 Insect and plant-disease control: For carrying out
23 operations or measures to eradicate, suppress, control, or to
24 prevent or retard the spread of Japanese beetle, sweetpotato
25 weevil, Mexican fruitflies, phony peach and peach mosaic,

1 cereal rusts, pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil, golden
2 nematode, citrus blackfly, white-fringed beetle, Hall scale,
3 and gypsy and brown-tail moths, including the enforce-
4 ment of quarantine regulations and cooperation with States
5 to enforce plant quarantines as authorized by the Plant
6 Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7
7 U. S. C. 151–167), and including the establishment of
8 such cotton-free areas as may be necessary to stamp out
9 any infestation of the pink bollworm as authorized by the
10 Act of February 8, 1930 (46 Stat. 67), and for cooperation
11 with States in the compensation of growers for losses result-
12 ing from the destruction of or for not planting potatoes and
13 tomatoes on lands infested or exposed to infestations of the
14 golden nematode for the purpose authorized by the Golden
15 Nematode Act (Public Law 645, approved June 15, 1948),
16 ~~$4,500,000~~ *$4,716,062*: *Provided*, That no part of this ap-
17 propriation shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees,
18 farm animals, farm crops, or other property injured or de-
19 stroyed, except potatoes and tomatoes as authorized under
20 the Golden Nematode Act: *Provided further*, That, in
21 the discretion of the Secretary, no part of this appro-
22 priation shall be expended for the control of sweet-
23 potato weevil in any State until such State has provided
24 cooperation necessary to accomplish this purpose, or for
25 barberry eradication until a sum or sums at least equal to

1 such expenditures shall have been appropriated, subscribed,
2 or contributed by States, counties, or local authorities, or
3 by individuals or organizations for the accomplishment of
4 this purpose, or with respect to the golden nematode except
5 as prescribed in section 4 of the Golden Nematode Act.

6 Plant quarantines: For operations against the in-
7 troduction of insect pests or plant diseases into the
8 United States, including the enforcement of foreign-
9 plant quarantines and regulations promulgated under sections
10 5 and 7 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912,
11 as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), the Insect Pest Act of
12 1905 (7 U. S. C. 141–144), and the Mexican Border Act
13 of 1942 (7 U. S. C. 149), for enforcement of domestic-
14 plant quarantines as they pertain to Territories and districts
15 of the United States, for the enforcement of plant quarantines
16 through inspection in transit, including the interception and
17 disposition of materials found to have been transported in
18 violation of Federal plant quarantine laws or regulations, and
19 operations under the Terminal Inspection Act (7 U. S. C.
20 166) and enforcement of regulations governing the move-
21 ment of plants into and from the District of Columbia
22 promulgated under section 15 of the Plant Quarantine Act
23 of August 20, 1912, as amended, and for inspection and
24 certification of plants and plant products to meet the sani-
25 tary requirements of foreign countries, as authorized in sec-

1 tion 102 of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a),
2 $2,600,000.

3 Control of Emergency Outbreaks of Insects and Plant
4 Diseases

5 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
6 the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C.
7 148–148e), including the operation and maintenance of air-
8 planes and the purchase of not to exceed two, and surveys
9 and control operations in Canada in cooperation with the
10 Canadian Government or local Canadian authorities, and
11 the employment of Canadian citizens, $1,800,000, of which
12 $1,000,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section
13 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, for the purposes
14 of said joint resolution only to the extent that the Secretary,
15 with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds neces-
16 sary to meet emergency conditions.

17 Control of Forest Pests

18 For expenses necessary for carrying out operations,
19 measures, or surveys necessary to eradicate, suppress, con-
20 trol, or to prevent or retard the spread of insects or diseases
21 which endanger forest trees on any lands in the United
22 States, and for such quarantine measures relating thereto
23 as may be necessary pursuant to the Plant Quarantine Act
24 of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167),

1 including the purchase (not to exceed two) and operation
2 and maintenance of airplanes, and construction and alteration
3 of necessary buildings: *Provided,* That the cost of construct-
4 ing or altering any one building during the fiscal year shall
5 not exceed $2,500, as follows:

6 Forest Pest Control Act: For carrying out the provi-
7 sions of the Act approved June 25, 1947 (16 U. S. C.,
8 Supp. I, 594-1—594-5), ~~$1,700,000~~ *$3,600,000,* of which
9 $500,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section
10 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, for the purposes
11 of said Act only to the extent that the Secretary, with the
12 approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to
13 meet emergency conditions.

14 White pine blister rust: White pine blister rust, pur-
15 suant to the Act of April 26, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 594a),
16 $3,300,000, of which $505,000 shall be available to the
17 Department of the Interior for the control of white pine
18 blister rust on or endangering Federal lands under the
19 jurisdiction of that Department or lands of Indian tribes
20 which are under the jurisdiction of or retained under re-
21 strictions of the United States; $1,750,000 to the Forest
22 Service for the control of white pine blister rust on or endan-
23 gering lands under its jurisdiction; and $1,045,000 to the
24 Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine for leadership
25 and general coordination of the entire program, method de-

1 velopment, and for operations conducted under its direction
2 for such control, including, but not confined to, the control of
3 white pine blister rust on or endangering State and privately
4 owned lands.

5 FOREST SERVICE

6 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

7 For expenses necessary, including not to exceed $10,000
8 for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section
9 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as
10 amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
11 (5 U. S. C. 55a); to experiment and make investigations
12 and report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and lum-
13 bering, but no part of this appropriation shall be used for
14 any experiment or test made outside the jurisdiction of the
15 United States; to advise the owners of woodlands as to
16 the proper care of the same; to investigate and test Amer-
17 ican timber and timber trees and their uses, and methods
18 for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek, through
19 investigations and the planting of native and foreign spe-
20 cies, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to erect neces-
21 sary buildings: *Provided,* That the cost of any building pur-
22 chased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost (not
23 to exceed $1,000) of constructing a water-supply or sani-
24 tary system and of connecting the same with any such
25 building, and exclusive of the cost of any tower upon which

1 a lookout house may be erected, shall not exceed $15,000,
2 with the exception that any building erected, purchased,
3 or acquired, the cost of which was $15,000 or more, may
4 be improved out of the appropriations made under this
5 Act for the Forest Service by an amount not to exceed 2
6 per centum of the cost of such building as certified by the
7 Chief of the Forest Service; to protect, administer, and
8 improve the national forests, including tree planting
9 and other measures to prevent erosion, drift, surface
10 wash, soil waste, and the formation of floods, and to con-
11 serve water; to ascertain the natural conditions upon and
12 utilize the national forests, to transport and care for fish
13 and game supplied to stock the national forests or the waters
14 therein; to collate, digest, report, and illustrate the results
15 of experiments and investigations made by the Forest Serv-
16 ice, as follows:

17 National forest protection and management: For the
18 administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement,
19 and development of the national forests, including the estab-
20 lishment and maintenance of forest tree nurseries, includ-
21 ing the procurement of tree seed and nursery stock by
22 purchase, production, or otherwise, seeding and tree plant-
23 ing and the care of plantations and young growth; the
24 operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of
25 not to exceed three; the maintenance of roads and trails

1 and the construction and maintenance of all other improve-
2 ments necessary for the proper and economical adminis-
3 tration, protection, development, and use of the national
4 forests, including experimental areas under Forest Service
5 administration, except that where direct purchases will be
6 more economical than construction, improvements may be
7 purchased; the construction (not to exceed $15,000 for
8 any one structure), equipment, and maintenance of sani-
9 tary and recreational facilities; timber cultural operations;
10 development and application of fish and game management
11 plans; propagation and transplanting of plants suitable for
12 planting on semiarid portions of the national forests; esti-
13 mating and appraising of timber and other resources and
14 development and application of plans for their effective
15 management, sale, and use; expenses of the National Forest
16 Reservation Commission as authorized by section 14 of the
17 Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 514); examination,
18 classification, surveying, and appraisal of land incident to
19 effecting exchanges authorized by law and of lands within
20 the boundaries of the national forests that may be opened
21 to homestead settlement and entry under the Act of June 11,
22 1906, and the Act of August 10, 1912 (16 U. S. C. 506–
23 509), as provided by the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C.
24 512); investigation and establishment of water rights, in-
25 cluding the purchase thereof or of lands or interests in lands

1 or rights-of-way for use and protection of water rights neces-
2 sary or beneficial in connection with the administration and
3 public use of the national forests; and all expenses necessary
4 for the use, maintenance, improvement, protection, and gen-
5 eral administration of the national forests, ~~$27,122,025~~
6 *$27,522,025*, of which not to exceed $75,000 shall be avail-
7 able for the purchase of three nursery sites.

8 Fighting forest fires: For fighting and preventing forest
9 fires on or threatening lands under Forest Service adminis-
10 tration, including lands under contract for purchase or in
11 process of condemnation for Forest Service purposes, and
12 for liquidation of obligations incurred in the preceding fiscal
13 year for such purpose, $6,000,000, of which $2,500,000
14 shall be apportioned for use, pursuant to section 3679 of the
15 Revised Statutes, as amended, only to the extent that the
16 Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget,
17 finds necessary to meet emergency conditions.

18 Forest research: For forest research at forest or range
19 experiment stations, the Forest Products Laboratory, or else-
20 where, in accordance with the provisions of sections 1, 2,
21 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the Act approved May 22, 1928, as
22 amended (16 U. S. C. 581, 581a, 581f–581i), including
23 the construction and maintenance of improvements; fire,
24 silvicultural, watershed, and other forest investigations and
25 experiments; investigations and experiments to develop im-

1 proved methods of management of forest and other ranges;
2 experiments, investigations, and tests of forest products; a
3 comprehensive forest survey; and investigations in forest
4 economics; ~~$5,220,500~~ *$5,108,603*: *Provided,* That here-
5 after funds may be received from any State, other political
6 subdivision, organization, or individual for the purpose of
7 establishing or operating any forest research facility located
8 within the United States, its Territories, or possessions.

9 FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

10 For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions
11 of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act approved No-
12 vember 9, 1921, as amended (23 U. S. C. 23, 23a), re-
13 lating to forest development roads and trails, including the
14 construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of roads and
15 trails on experimental areas under Forest Service administra-
16 tion, ~~$11,500,000~~ *$14,500,000,* which sum is authorized to
17 be appropriated by the Acts of June 29, 1948 (Public
18 Law 834), and September 7, 1950 (Public Law 769),
19 to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That
20 this appropriation shall be available for the rental, purchase,
21 construction, or alteration of buildings necessary for the
22 storage and repair of equipment and supplies used for road
23 and trail construction and maintenance, but the total cost
24 of any such building purchased, altered, or constructed under
25 this authorization shall not exceed $15,000 with the excep-

1 tion that any building erected, purchased, or acquired, the
2 cost of which was $15,000 or more, may be improved
3 within any fiscal year by an amount not to exceed 2 per
4 centum of the cost of such buildings certified by the Chief of
5 the Forest Service.

6 ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

7 Weeks Act

8 For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions
9 of the Act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16
10 U. S. C. 513–519, 521), ~~$50,000~~ *$100,000,* to be available
11 only for payment toward the purchase price of any
12 lands acquired, including the cost of surveys in con-
13 nection with such acquisition: *Provided,* That no part of
14 such funds shall be used for the purchase of lands in the
15 counties of Adair, Cherokee, and Sequoyah, in the State
16 of Oklahoma, without the specific approval of the Board
17 of County Commissioners of the county in which such lands
18 are situated.

19 Superior National Forest

20 For the acquisition of forest land within the Superior
21 National Forest, Minnesota, under the provisions of the
22 Act approved June 22, 1948 (Public Law 733), ~~$100,000~~
23 *$150,000,* to remain available until expended.

24 Special Acts

25 For the acquisition of land to facilitate the control of

1 soil erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior
2 boundaries of the following national forests, in accordance
3 with the provisions of the following Acts authorizing annual
4 appropriations of forest receipts for such purposes, and in
5 not to exceed the following amounts from such receipts:
6 Uinta and Wasatch National Forests, Utah, Act of August
7 26, 1935 (Public Law 337), as amended, ~~$40,000~~ *$39,830*;
8 Cache National Forest, Utah, Act of May 11, 1938 (Public
9 Law 505), as amended, $10,000; San Bernardino and
10 Cleveland National Forests, Riverside County, California,
11 Act of June 15, 1938 (Public Law 634), as amended,
12 $22,000; Nevada and Toiyabe National Forests, Nevada,
13 Act of June 25, 1938 (Public Law 748), as amended,
14 $10,000; Angeles National Forest, California, Act of June
15 11, 1940 (Public Law 591), $20,000; Cleveland National
16 Forest, San Diego County, California, Act of June 11, 1940
17 (Public Law 589), $5,000; Sequoia National Forest,
18 California, Act of June 17, 1940 (Public Law 637),
19 ~~$35,000~~ *$34,850*; in all ~~$142,000~~ *$141,680*.

20 STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

21 For expenses necessary for cooperation with the various
22 States in forest-fire prevention and suppression, in forest
23 tree planting, in forest management and processing, and in
24 farm forestry extension, pursuant to the Act of August 25,

1950 (Public Law 729), and sections 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the Act of June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 564–568a), and Acts supplementary thereto; advising timberland owners, associations, and other appropriate agencies in the application of forest management principles to federally owned lands leased to States and to private forest lands, and advising wood-using industries in processing of forest products, so as to attain sustained-yield management, the conservation of the timber resources, the productivity of forest lands, and the stabilization of employment and economic continuance of forest industries; $10,750,000.

COOPERATIVE RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious plants on national forests, as authorized by section 12 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (Public Law 478), $700,000, to remain available until expended.

FLOOD CONTROL

For expenses necessary, in accordance with the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law 738), as amended and supplemented, to make preliminary examinations and surveys, and to perform works of improvement, and to plan the agricultural phases of the development of the Columbia Basin area, the Arkansas-White-Red River area, and the New England-New York area, in accordance with

1 the provisions of laws relating to the activities of the
2 Department, including not to exceed $100,000 for em-
3 ployment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a)
4 of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by
5 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a),
6 to remain available until expended, ~~$6,112,800~~ *$6,372,800,*
7 with which shall be merged the unexpended balances of funds
8 heretofore appropriated or transferred to the Department for
9 flood-control purposes: *Provided,* That no part of such funds
10 shall be used for the purchase of lands in the Yazoo and
11 Little Tallahatchie watersheds without specific approval of
12 the county board of supervisors of the county in which such
13 lands are situated, nor shall any part of such funds be used
14 for the purchase of lands in the counties of Adair, Cherokee,
15 and Sequoyah, in the State of Oklahoma, without the specific
16 approval of the Board of County Commissioners of the
17 county in which such lands are situated: *Provided fur-*
18 *ther,* That of the funds available herein, not in excess of
19 $6,000,000 (with which shall be merged the unexpended
20 balance of funds heretofore made available for these pur-
21 poses) may be expended in watersheds heretofore author-
22 ized by section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December
23 22, 1944, for necessary gully control, floodwater detention,
24 and floodway structures in areas other than those over
25 which the Department of the Army has jurisdiction and

1 reponsibility: *Provided further, That not in excess of $60,000*
2 *of the funds made available herein may be used for surveys*
3 *of the watersheds of the Big Nemaha River, Little Nemaha*
4 *River, and Weeping Water Creek in Nebraska and such sur-*
5 *veys shall be coordinated with the investigations of the Corps*
6 *of Engineers.*

7 SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

8 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9 For necessary expenses for carrying out the provisions
10 of the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f),
11 title III of the Act of July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010–
12 1012), and the Act of August 11, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 1011
13 note), including research and investigations into the charac-
14 ter, cause, extent, history, and effects of erosion, soil and
15 moisture depletion, and methods of soil and water conserva-
16 tion (including the construction and hydrologic phases of
17 farm irrigation and land drainage, and the construction,
18 operation, and maintenance of experimental watersheds,
19 stations, laboratories, plots, and installations ~~and water regu-~~
20 ~~lation to conserve the soil and reduce fire hazards in the~~
21 ~~Everglades region of Florida, except that expenditures for~~
22 ~~all work in the Everglades region shall be limited to a sum~~
23 ~~not in excess of funds made available for such work by the~~
24 ~~State of Florida, or political subdivisions thereof~~); making
25 conservation surveys and plans and establishing measures to

1 conserve soil and water (including farm irrigation and land
2 drainage and such special measures as may be necessary
3 to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs) ; establish-
4 ment and operation of conservation nurseries; development
5 and management of land utilization project lands and facili-
6 ties; dissemination of information; purchase and erection
7 or alteration of permanent buildings; operation and mainte-
8 nance of aircraft; and furnishing of subsistence to employees;
9 ~~$54,278,000~~ *$53,474,991*: *Provided,* That the cost of any
10 permanent building purchased, erected, or as improved, ex-
11 clusive of the cost of constructing a water supply or sanitary
12 system and connecting the same to any such building and with
13 the exception of buildings acquired in conjunction with land
14 being purchased for other purposes, shall not exceed $2,500,
15 except for eight buildings to be constructed or improved at a
16 cost not to exceed $15,000 per building and except that
17 alterations or improvements to other existing permanent
18 buildings costing $2,500 or more may be made in any fiscal
19 year in an amount not to exceed $500 per building: *Provided*
20 *further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be available
21 for the construction of any such building on land not owned
22 by the Government: *Provided further,* That in the State of
23 Missouri, where the State has established a central State
24 agency authorized to enter into agreements with the United
25 States or any of its agencies on policies and general pro-

1 grams for the saving of its soil by the extension of Federal
2 aid to any soil conservation district in such State, the agree-
3 ments made by or on behalf of the United States with any
4 such soil conservation district shall have the prior approval
5 of such central State agency before they shall become effective
6 as to such district: *Provided further,* That no part of this
7 appropriation may be expended for soil and water conserva-
8 tion operations under the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C.
9 590a–590f), in demonstration projects: *Provided further,*
10 That not to exceed $5,000 may be used for employment pur-
11 suant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic
12 Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15
13 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided*
14 *further,* That not to exceed $265,000 of funds authorized
15 for fiscal year 1951 for development of land utilization proj-
16 ects may remain available until expended: *Provided further,*
17 That qualified local engineers may be temporarily employed
18 at per diem rates to perform the technical planning work of
19 the service.

20 WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

21 For expenses necessary to carry into effect the functions
22 of the Department under the Acts of May 10, 1939 (53 Stat.
23 685, 719), October 14, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 590y–z–10), as
24 amended and supplemented, June 28, 1949 (Public Law
25 132), and September 6, 1950 (Public Law 760), relating

1 to water conservation and utilization projects, to remain
2 available until expended, ~~$185,500~~ *$285,500,* which sum
3 shall be merged with the unexpended balances of funds
4 heretofore appropriated or transferred to said Department
5 for the purposes of said Act.

6 PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION
7 CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND
8 RESOURCES

9 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the pro-
10 visions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation
11 and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936,
12 as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q), including not to
13 exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits,
14 including such displays at State, interstate, and international
15 fairs within the United States; ~~$256,500,000~~ *$280,000,000,*
16 to remain available until December 31 of the next succeeding
17 fiscal year for compliance with the program of soil-building
18 practices and soil- and water-conserving practices authorized
19 under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appro-
20 priation Act, 1951, carried out during the period July 1,
21 1950, to December 31, 1951, inclusive: *Provided,* That not
22 to exceed $25,250,000 of the total sum provided under
23 this head shall be available during the current fiscal year
24 for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying
25 out such program, the cost of aerial photographs, however,

1 not to be charged to such limitation; but not more than
2 $4,966,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account,
3 "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjust-
4 ment Act of 1938": *Provided further,* That payments to
5 claimants hereunder may be made upon the certificate of
6 the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the
7 Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the con-
8 servation practice or practices and has complied with all
9 other requirements as conditions for such payments and that
10 the statements and information contained in the application
11 for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge
12 and belief, under the penalties of title 18, United States Code:
13 *Provided further,* That none of the funds herein appropriated
14 or made available for the functions assigned to the Agri-
15 cultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order
16 Numbered 9069, of February 23, 1942, shall be used to
17 pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information
18 employees or any State information employees, but this shall
19 not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of in-
20 formation at the county level to individual farmers: *Provided*
21 *further,* That such amount shall be available for salaries and
22 other administrative expenses in connection with the formu-
23 lation and administration of the 1952 program of soil-
24 building practices and soil- and water-conserving practices,
25 under the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended (amount-

1 ing to ~~$225,000,000~~ *$280,000,000*, including administration,
2 and formulated on the basis of a distribution of the funds avail-
3 able for payments and grants among the several States in ac-
4 cordance with their conservation needs as determined by the
5 Secretary, except that the proportion allocated to any State
6 shall not be reduced more than 15 per centum from the
7 distribution for the next preceding program year, and no
8 participant shall receive more than $2,500) ; but the pay-
9 ments or grants under such programs shall be conditioned
10 upon the utilization of land with respect to which such pay-
11 ments or grants are to be made in conformity with farming
12 practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building
13 and soil- and water-conserving practices in the most practical
14 and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several
15 States, as determined and approved by the State committees
16 appointed pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation
17 and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590h
18 (b)), for the respective States: *Provided further*, ~~That not~~
19 ~~to exceed 5 per centum of the allocation for the agricultural~~
20 ~~conservation program for any county may be allotted with~~
21 ~~the approval of the State committee to the Soil Conservation~~
22 ~~Service for services of its technicians in formulating and~~
23 ~~carrying out the agricultural conservation program and the~~
24 ~~funds so allotted shall not be utilized by the Soil Conserva-~~

1 ~~tion Service for any purpose other than technical and other~~
2 ~~assistance in such county~~ *That not to exceed 5 per centum*
3 *of the allocation for the agricultural conservation program*
4 *for any county may, on the recommendation of such county*
5 *committee and approval of the State committee, be withheld*
6 *and allotted to the Soil Conservation Service for services of*
7 *its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricul-*
8 *tural conservation program in the participating counties,*
9 *and the funds so allotted may be placed in a single account*
10 *for each State, and shall not be utilized by the Soil Conser-*
11 *vation Service for any purpose other than technical and*
12 *other assistance in such counties*: *Provided further,* That such
13 amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, ferti-
14 lizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any
15 soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agri-
16 cultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming
17 practices approved by the Secretary under programs provided
18 for herein: *Provided further,* That no part of any funds
19 available to the Department, or any bureau, office, cor-
20 poration, or other agency constituting a part of such Depart-
21 ment, shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment
22 of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been
23 convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent
24 pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as

1 amended, or who has been found in accordance with the
2 provisions of title 18, United States Code, section 1913, to
3 have violated or attempted to violate such section which
4 prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the pay-
5 ment of personal services or other expenses designed to influ-
6 ence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose
7 any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon
8 request of any Member or through the proper official
9 channels.

10 AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION PROGRAMS

11 To enable the Secretary to formulate and carry out acre-
12 age allotment and marketing quota programs pursuant to
13 provisions of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act
14 of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1301–1393), including
15 the measurement of the acreage planted to cotton on the
16 farms whether or not marketing quotas are in effect, provid-
17 ing that not more than $1,000,000 shall be available for
18 this purpose, and to provide assistance in obtaining equip-
19 ment, materials, and facilities necessary to attain needed
20 production of agricultural commodities, ~~$8,300,000~~ *$12,-*
21 *000,000,* of which not more than ~~$2,000,000~~ *$2,800,000*
22 shall be transferred to the appropriation account "Adminis-
23 trative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act
24 of 1938".

1 SUGAR ACT PROGRAM

2 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the pro-
3 visions of the Sugar Act of 1948 (7 U. S. C. 1101–1160),
4 $70,000,000, to remain available until June 30 of the next
5 succeeding fiscal year: *Provided,* That expenditures (includ-
6 ing transfers) from this appropriation for other than pay-
7 ments to sugar producers shall not exceed $1,500,000.

8 NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

9 To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of
10 the National School Lunch Act (42 U. S. C. 1751–1760),
11 ~~$83,500,000~~ *$83,367,491*: *Provided,* That no part of this
12 appropriation shall be used for nonfood assistance under
13 section 5 of said Act.

14 MARKETING SERVICES

15 For expenses necessary for acquiring and diffusing
16 market information on agricultural commodities, food prod-
17 ucts and by-products, the standardization, classification,
18 grading, handling, storage and marketing thereof, including
19 the demonstration and promotion of the use of uniform stand-
20 ards of classification of American farm and food products
21 throughout the world, the analysis of cotton fiber, the classing
22 of cotton for producer members of cotton quality improve-
23 ment groups, the establishment of classification standards and
24 maintenance of an inspection service for tobacco (7. U. S. C.
25 471–476, 501–508, 511–511q); for investigating and certi-

1 fying, in one or more jurisdictions, to shippers and other
2 interested parties the class, quality, and condition of any
3 agricultural commodity or food product, whether raw or
4 processed, and any product containing an agricultural com-
5 modity or derivative thereof when offered for interstate ship-
6 ment or when received at such important central markets as
7 the Secretary may from time to time designate, or at points
8 which may be conveniently reached therefrom under such
9 rules and regulations as he may prescribe, including the
10 collection of such fees as are reasonable and as nearly as may
11 cover the cost of the service rendered; for performing the
12 duties imposed upon the Secretary by chapter 14 of the
13 Internal Revenue Code relating to cotton futures (26
14 U. S. C. 1920–1935); and for carrying into effect the
15 United States Cotton Standards Act (7 U. S. C. 51–65),
16 the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U. S. C. 71–87),
17 the Naval Stores Act (7 U. S. C. 91–99), section 201 (a)
18 to 201 (d), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjust-
19 ment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1291), including not to
20 exceed $25,000 for employment at rates not to exceed $100
21 per diem, pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a),
22 of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended
23 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a),
24 the Acts to provide standards for containers for fruits and
25 vegetables (15 U. S. C. 251–257i), the United States Ware-

1 house Act (7 U. S. C. 241–273), the Federal Seed Act
2 (7 U. S. C. 1551–1610), the Packers and Stockyards Act
3 (7 U. S. C. 181–229), the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide,
4 and Rodenticide Act (7 U. S. C. 135–135k), and the
5 Tobacco Plant and Seed Exportation Act (7 U. S. C. 516),
6 $10,800,000: *Provided,* ~~That hereafter appropriations avail-~~
7 ~~able for classing or grading any agricultural commodity with-~~
8 ~~out charge to the producers thereof may be reimbursed from~~
9 ~~nonadministrative funds of the Commodity Credit Corpora-~~
10 ~~tion for the cost of classing or grading any such commodity~~
11 ~~for producers who are eligible to obtain Commodity Credit~~
12 ~~Corporation price support~~ *That hereafter there may be trans-*
13 *ferred to appropriations available for classing or grading any*
14 *agricultural commodity without charge to the producers*
15 *thereof such sums from nonadministrative funds of the Com-*
16 *modity Credit Corporation as may be necessary in addition*
17 *to other funds available for these purposes, such transfers to*
18 *be reimbursed from subsequent appropiations therefor.*

19 COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

20 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provi-
21 sions of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7
22 U. S. C. 1–17a), ~~$650,000~~ *$591,072.*

23 FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

24 For operating and administrative expenses, ~~$8,000,000~~
25 *$7,949,911.*

1 RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

2 To carry into effect the provisions of the Rural Elec-
3 trification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–924),
4 as follows:

5 LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS

6 For loans in accordance with said Act, and for carry-
7 ing out the provisions of section 7 thereof, to be borrowed
8 from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the
9 provisions of section 3 (a) of said Act as follows: Rural
10 electrification program, $100,000,000; and rural telephone
11 program, $9,000,000; and additional amounts, not to ex-
12 ceed ~~a total of $100,000,000~~ *$75,000,000,* may be borrowed
13 for the rural electrification program, *and $25,000,000 for*
14 *the rural telephone program,* under the same terms and con-
15 ditions to the extent that such additional amounts are
16 required during the fiscal year 1952, under the then existing
17 conditions, for the expeditious and orderly development of
18 the program.

19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

20 For administrative expenses, including not to exceed
21 $500 for financial and credit reports, and not to exceed
22 $150,000 for employment pursuant to the second sentence
23 of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C.
24 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
25 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), $7,750,000.

1 FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

2 To carry into effect the provisions of titles I, II, and
3 the related provisions of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones
4 Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1000–1031),
5 the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946 (7 U. S. C.
6 1001, note; 31 U. S. C. 82h; 12 U. S. C. 371; 35 D. C.
7 Code 535; 60 Stat. 1062–1080); the Act of July 30, 1946
8 (40 U. S. C. 436–439); the Act of August 28, 1937, as
9 amended (16 U. S. C. 590r–590x, 590z–5), for the devel-
10 opment of facilities for water storage and utilization in the
11 arid and semiarid areas of the United States; the
12 provisions of title V of the Housing Act of 1949 relating
13 to financial assistance for farm housing (42 U. S. C. 1471–
14 1483); the Rural Rehabilitation Corporation Trust Liquida-
15 tion Act, approved May 3, 1950 (Public Law 499); and
16 the Act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey
17 certain mineral interests, approved September 6, 1950
18 (Public Law 760), as follows:

19 LOAN AUTHORIZATION

20 For loans (including payments in lieu of taxes and
21 taxes under section 50 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant
22 Act, as amended, and advances incident to the acquisition
23 and preservation of security of obligations under the fore-
24 going several authorities): Title I and section 43 of title IV
25 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and

1 title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (except grants under
2 504 (a)) $38,000,000, of which not to exceed $5,000,000
3 of the amount available for the purposes of title I and sec-
4 tion 43 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as
5 amended, may be distributed to States and Territories with-
6 out regard to farm population and prevalence of tenancy,
7 in addition to the amount otherwise distributed thereto, for
8 loans in reclamation projects and to entrymen on unpatented
9 public land (sums available for loans under title V of the
10 Housing Act of 1949 to remain available until expended);
11 title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended,
12 ~~$100,000,000~~ *$110,000,000*; the Act of August 28, 1937, as
13 amended, ~~$4,250,000~~ *$5,000,000*: *Provided*, That not to ex-
14 ceed the foregoing several amounts shall be borrowed in one
15 account from the Secretary of the Treasury, and, hereafter,
16 such sums annually for the purposes of this paragraph as the
17 Congress may determine by provision in appropriation
18 acts, on the request of the Secretary of Agriculture, at
19 such rate of interest as may be determined by the Secre-
20 tary of the Treasury, but not in excess of 3 per centum
21 per annum; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby
22 authorized and directed to lend such sums to the Secretary
23 upon the security of any obligations of borrowers from
24 the Secretary under the provisions of said Acts: *Provided*
25 *further*, That the Secretary may utilize proceeds from

1 payments of principal and interest under such Acts to
2 repay the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts borrowed
3 therefrom for the purposes of such Acts: *Provided further,*
4 That for the purpose of making loans pursuant to the fore-
5 going authority, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized
6 to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the
7 sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond
8 Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may
9 be issued under that Act are extended to include such loans
10 to the Secretary: *Provided further,* That repayments to the
11 Secretary of the Treasury on such loans shall be treated as a
12 public-debt transaction.

13 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

14 For the making, servicing, and collecting of loans and
15 insured mortgages, the servicing and collecting of loans made
16 under prior authority, the liquidation of assets transferred
17 to Farmers' Home Administration pursuant to the Farmers'
18 Home Administration Act of 1946, the extension of financial
19 assistance under the Housing Act of 1949, and the adminis-
20 tration of assets transferred under subsection 2 (f) of the
21 Act of May 3, 1950, ~~$27,500,000~~ *$28,150,000,* together
22 with a transfer to this appropriation item of not to exceed
23 $230,000 of the fees and administrative expense charges
24 made available by subsections (d) and (e) of section 12
25 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended.

Farm Credit Administration

For necessary expenses, including library membership fees or dues in organizations which issue publications to members only or to members at a lower price than to others, payment for which may be made in advance; not to exceed $20,000 for expenditures authorized by section 602 of the Organic Act of 1944 (12 U. S. C. 833); ~~$300,000~~ *$400,000*, together with not to exceed $2,325,000 of receipts from Farm Credit agencies, to be advanced to this appropriation, to cover the cost of supervision, facilities, examinations, and other services rendered to such agencies; ~~$2,625,000~~ *$2,725,000*.

Extension Service

PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, ALASKA, AND PUERTO RICO

For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, for cooperative agricultural extension work as follows:

Capper-Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts: Capper-Ketcham Act, the Act approved May 22, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 343a, 343b), $1,480,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, section 21, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 343c), $12,000,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, section 23, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended by the Act of June 6, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 343d–1), $12,500,000; additional extension work, the Act approved April 24, 1939, as amended (7 U. S. C. 343c–1), $555,000;

1 Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C.
2 386c), extending the benefits of the Smith-Lever Act to the
3 Territory of Alaska, $13,950, and the Act approved Octo-
4 ber 27, 1949 (7 U. S. C. 343d–4, 5), extending to
5 the Territory of Alaska the benefits of the Capper-
6 Ketcham Act and sections 21 and 23 of title II of
7 the Bankhead-Jones Act, $42,150; Puerto Rico, section 3
8 of the Act of March 4, 1931 (7 U. S. C. 386f), author-
9 izing extension of the Capper-Ketcham Act to Puerto Rico,
10 $31,348; the Act approved August 28, 1937 (7 U. S. C.
11 343f–343g), extending the benefits of section 21 of the
12 Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, $408,000, and the Act
13 approved October 26, 1949 (7 U. S. C. 343d–2, 3), ex-
14 tending the benefits of section 23 of title II of the Bank-
15 head-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, $71,502; and section 506a
16 of title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U. S. C. 1476),
17 $33,050; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and
18 Puerto Rico, $27,135,000.

19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

20 For expenses necessary to administer the provisions of
21 the Smith-Lever Act, approved May 8, 1914 (7 U. S. C.
22 341–348), and Acts amendatory or supplementary thereto,
23 and to coordinate the extension work of the Department and
24 the several States, Territories, and insular possessions,
25 ~~$880,000~~ *$818,673.*

1 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

2 For expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agricul-
3 ture, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle
4 for replacement only; travel expenses, including examina-
5 tion of estimates for appropriations in the field; stationery,
6 supplies, materials, and equipment; freight, express, and
7 drayage charges; advertising of bids, communication service,
8 postage, washing towels, repairs and alterations, and other
9 miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided
10 for and necessarly for the practical and efficient work of the
11 Department of Agriculture, ~~$2,082,200~~ *$1,992,168*, together
12 with such amounts from other appropriations or author-
13 izations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget
14 for the current fiscal year for such services and expenses,
15 which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be de-
16 termined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $109,280,
17 shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation:
18 *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appro-
19 priations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall
20 at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated,
21 respectively, therefor in the budget for such year, the
22 amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this
23 appropriation shall be increased or decreased in such amounts
24 as the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with
25 representatives of the Department, shall determine are ap-

1 propriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions
2 or increases in such appropriations or authorizations.

3 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

4 For necessary expenses, including payment of fees or
5 dues for the use of law libraries by attorneys in the field
6 service, $2,200,000, together with such amounts from other
7 appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the
8 schedules in the budget for the current fiscal year for such
9 expenses which several amounts not exceeding a total of
10 $207,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of this
11 appropriation.

12 OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

13 For necessary expenses for the Office of Foreign Agri-
14 cultural Relations and for enabling the Secretary to coordi-
15 nate and integrate activities of the Department in connec-
16 tion with foreign agricultural work, including the purchase
17 of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only,
18 ~~$600,000~~ *$548,054.*

19 OFFICE OF INFORMATION

20 For necessary expenses in connection with the publica-
21 tion, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins, docu-
22 ments, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and dis-
23 play of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and exhibits,
24 and the coordination of informational work and programs
25 authorized by Congress in the Department, ~~$1,271,000~~

1 *$1,215,268*, together with such amounts from other appro-
2 priations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules
3 in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses,
4 which several amounts not exceeding a total of $16,200, shall
5 be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation,
6 of which total appropriation amounts not exceeding those
7 specified may be used for the purposes enumerated as fol-
8 lows: For preparation and display of exhibits, $104,725;
9 for preparation, distribution, and display of motion and
10 sound pictures, $75,600; for farmers' bulletins, which
11 shall be adapted to the interests of the people of the
12 different sections of the country, an equal proportion
13 of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or sent out under
14 the addressed franks furnished by the Senators, Representa-
15 tives, and Delegates in Congress, as they shall direct (7
16 U. S. C. 417) and not less than two hundred thirty thousand
17 eight hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Senate and
18 House of Representatives of part 2 of the annual report of
19 the Secretary (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture),
20 as authorized by section 73 of the Act of January 12, 1895
21 (44 U. S. C. 241), $611,128: *Provided,* That additional
22 funds for preparation and display of agricultural motion
23 pictures and exhibits relating to the programs of the various
24 agencies of the Department authorized by Congress, not
25 exceeding $150,000, may be transferred to and made a

1 part of this appropriation, from the funds applicable, and
2 shall be available for the objects specified herein: *Provided*
3 *further*, That in the preparation of motion pictures or exhibits
4 by the Department, not exceeding a total of $10,000 may
5 be used for employment pursuant to the second sentence of
6 section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C.
7 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
8 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further*, That no part
9 of this appropriation shall be used for the establishment or
10 maintenance of regional or State field offices, or for the com-
11 pensation of employees in such offices.

12 LIBRARY

13 For necessary expenses, including dues for library
14 membership in societies or associations which issue publica-
15 tions to members only or at a price to members lower than
16 to subscribers who are not members; ~~$700,000~~ *$641,237*.

17 TITLE II—SPECIAL ACTIVITIES

18 RESEARCH ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL AGRICULTURAL
19 MATERIALS

20 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry
21 out his responsibilities under section 7 (b) of the Strategic
22 and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of July 23, 1946
23 (50 U. S. C. 98f), ~~$450,000~~ *$650,000*: *Provided*, That
24 this appropriation shall be subject to applicable provisions

1 contained in the item "Office of Administrator, Agricultural
2 Research Administration".

3 Eradication of Foot-and-Mouth Disease and Other Contagious
4 Diseases of Animals and Poultry, Agricultural Research
5 Administration

6 For expenses necessary in the arrest and eradication
7 of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuro-
8 pneumonia, or other contagious or infectious diseases of
9 animals, or European fowl pest and similar diseases in poul-
10 try, including the payment of claims growing out of past
11 and future purchases and destruction of animals (including
12 poultry) affected by or exposed to, or of materials con-
13 taminated by or exposed to, any such disease, wherever
14 found and irrespective of ownership, under like or substan-
15 tially similar circumstances, when such owner has complied
16 with all lawful quarantine regulations; and for foot-and-
17 mouth disease and rinderpest programs undertaken pur-
18 suant to the provisions of the Act of February 28, 1947, and
19 the Act of May 29, 1884, as amended (7 U. S. C. 391; 21
20 U. S. C. 111–122), including expenses in accordance with
21 section 2 of said Act of February 28, 1947, the Secretary may
22 transfer from other appropriations or funds available to the
23 bureaus, corporations, or agencies of the Department such
24 sums as he may deem necessary, to be available only in an

1 emergency which threatens the livestock or poultry industry
2 of the country, and any unexpended balances of funds trans-
3 ferred under this head in the next preceding fiscal year shall
4 be merged with such transferred amounts: *Provided,* That,
5 except for payments made pursuant to said Act of Febru-
6 ary 28, 1947, the payment for such animals hereafter pur-
7 chased may be made on appraisement based on the meat,
8 egg-production, dairy, or breeding value, but in case of ap-
9 praisement based on breeding value no appraisement of any
10 such animal shall exceed three times its meat, egg-produc-
11 tion, or dairy value, and, except in case of an extraordinary
12 emergency, to be determined by the Secretary, the pay-
13 ment by the United States Government for any such animals
14 shall not exceed one-half of any such appraisements: *Pro-*
15 *vided further,* That poultry may be appraised in groups
16 when the basis for appraisal is the same for each bird: *Pro-*
17 *vided further,* That this appropriation shall be subject to
18 applicable provisions contained in the item "Office of Ad-
19 ministrator, Agricultural Research Administration": *Pro-*
20 *vided further,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby
21 authorized and directed to discharge indebtedness of the
22 Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the
23 Treasury by canceling notes issued by the Corporation to
24 the Secretary of the Treasury in the amount of $32,700,000
25 for funds transferred and expenses incurred under this head

through fiscal year 1950 pursuant to authority granted in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1950.

TITLE III—CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the fiscal year 1952 for such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

Commodity Credit Corporation: Nothing in this Act shall be so construed as to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from carrying out any activity or any program authorized by law: *Provided,* That not to exceed ~~$15,000,000~~ *$16,500,000* shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corporation: *Provided further,* That all necessary expenses (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an

1 interest, including expenses of collections of pledged col-
2 lateral, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses
3 for the purposes hereof: *Provided further,* That the Sec-
4 retary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed
5 to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corpo-
6 ration to the Secretary of the Treasury by canceling notes
7 issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury
8 in the amount of the capital impairment determined by the
9 appraisal of June 30, 1950 (but not to exceed $427,-
10 000,000), pursuant to sections 1 and 4 of the Act of
11 March 8, 1938, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a-1, 4):
12 *Provided further,* That $1,000,000 of this appropriation shall
13 be placed in reserve, to be apportioned for use pursuant to
14 section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, only in
15 such amounts and at such times as may become necessary
16 due to the existence of substantial surpluses of the basic
17 commodities requiring mandatory price support.

18 Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation: Not to exceed
19 $1,100,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the
20 funds of the Corporation shall be available for administrative
21 expenses, including employment on a contract or fee basis of
22 persons, firms, and corporations for the performance of special
23 services, including legal services, and the use of the services
24 and facilities of Federal land banks, national farm loan asso-
25 ciations, Federal Reserve banks, and agencies of the Gov-

1 ernment as authorized by the Act of January 31, 1934
2 (12 U. S. C. 1020–1020h); and said total sum shall be
3 exclusive of services and facilities furnished and examina-
4 tions made by the Farm Credit Administration central
5 office, interest expense, and expenses in connection with
6 the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, pro-
7 tection, or disposition of real or personal property belong-
8 ing to the Corporation or in which it has an interest:
9 *Provided,* That promptly after June 30 of each fiscal year
10 all cash funds in excess of the estimated operating require-
11 ments for the current fiscal year shall be declared as divi-
12 dends and paid into the general fund of the Treasury: *Pro-*
13 *vided further,* That the aggregate amount of bonds the
14 Corporation may issue and have outstanding at any one time
15 shall not exceed $500,000,000.

16 Federal intermediate credit banks: Not to exceed
17 $1,496,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis)
18 of the funds of the banks shall be available for
19 administrative expenses and services performed for the
20 banks by other Government agencies (except services and
21 facilities furnished and examinations made by the Farm
22 Credit Administration central office, and services performed
23 by any Federal Reserve bank and by the United States
24 Treasury in connection with the financial transactions of
25 the banks); and said total sum shall be exclusive of interest

1 expense, legal and special services performed on a contract
2 or fee basis, and expenses in connection with the acquisition,
3 operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or dis-
4 position of real or personal property belonging to the banks
5 or in which they have an interest.

6 Production credit corporations: Not to exceed $1,-
7 358,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the
8 funds of the corporations shall be available for ad-
9 ministrative expenses and services performed for the cor-
10 porations by other Government agencies (except services
11 and facilities furnished and examinations made by the Farm
12 Credit Administration central office); and said total sum
13 shall be exclusive of interest expense, legal and special
14 services performed on a contract or fee basis, and expenses
15 in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance,
16 improvement, protection, or disposition of real or personal
17 property belonging to the corporations or in which they
18 have an interest.

19 TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

20 SEC. 401. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by
21 law, the lump-sum appropriations and authorizations made
22 for the Department under this Act shall be available for
23 the purchase, in addition to those specifically provided for,
24 of not to exceed 497 passenger motor vehicles for
25 replacement only, and for the hire of such vehicles, necessary

1 in the conduct of the work of the Department outside the
2 District of Columbia.

3 SEC. 402. Provisions of law prohibiting or re-
4 stricting the employment of aliens shall not apply to (1)
5 the temporary employment of translators when competent
6 citizen translators are not available; (2) employment in
7 cases of emergency of persons in the field service of the
8 Department for periods of not more than sixty days; and
9 (3) employment under the appropriation for the Office of
10 Foreign Agricultural Relations.

11 SEC. 403. Of appropriations herein made which
12 are available for the purchase of lands, not to exceed $1
13 may be expended for each option to purchase any partic-
14 ular tract or tracts of land.

15 SEC. 404. No part of the funds appropriated
16 by this Act shall be used for the payment of any officer
17 or employee of the Department who, as such officer or
18 employee, or on behalf of the Department or any division,
19 commission, or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued,
20 any prediction, oral or written, or forecast, except as to
21 damage threatened or caused by insects and pests, with
22 respect to future prices of cotton or the trend of same.

23 SEC. 405. Except to provide materials required
24 in or incident to research or experimental work where no
25 suitable domestic product is available, no part of the funds

appropriated by this Act shall be expended in the purchase of twine manufactured from commodities or materials produced outside of the United States.

SEC. 406. Not less than $575,000 shall be available for contracts in accordance with section 10 (a) of the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427i) from appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Agricultural Economics; Bureau of Animal Industry; Bureau of Dairy Industry; Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering; Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine; Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry; Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics; and the Forest Service.

~~SEC. 407. No part of the funds made available by this Act may be used to compensate any person for employment in the Federal service outside the continental limits of the United States at a rate higher than is paid for comparable work in the Federal service within the continental limits of the United States, other than a person who was a resident citizen of the continental United States at the date of his appointment to a position outside the continental limits of the United States and has had continuous employment in the Federal service (except as interrupted by service in the Armed Forces of the United States) from the date of such appointment.~~

1 SEC. ~~408~~ *407*. Notwithstanding any other provisions of
2 law, the Department is hereby authorized hereafter to employ
3 or otherwise contract with persons at regular rates of pay for
4 necessary hours of work for emergency forest fire fighting and
5 pest control and for handling of animals, including dairy
6 cattle, without regard to Sundays, Federal holidays, and
7 the regular workweek.

8 SEC. ~~409~~ *408*. No part of any appropriation contained in
9 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any cor-
10 poration included in this Act, shall be used to pay the salary
11 or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the
12 Government of the United States or who is a member of an
13 organization of Government employees that asserts the right
14 to strike against the Government of the United States, or who
15 advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates,
16 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by
17 force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an
18 affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the
19 person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions
20 of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of
21 the United States, is not a member of an organization of
22 Government employees that asserts the right to strike against
23 the Government of the United States, or that such person
24 does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization
25 that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the

1 United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That
2 any person who engages in a strike against the Government
3 of the United States or who is a member of an organization
4 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike
5 against the Government of the United States, or who advo-
6 cates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates,
7 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by
8 force or violence and accepts employment the salary or
9 wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund
10 contained in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon
11 conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned
12 for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That
13 the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in
14 substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Pro-*
15 *vided further*, That nothing in this section shall be construed
16 to require an affidavit from any person employed for less
17 than sixty days for sudden emergency work involving the
18 loss of human life or destruction of property, the payment
19 of salary or wages may be made to such persons from ap-
20 plicable appropriations for services rendered in such emer-
21 gency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by
22 this section.

23 No part of any appropriation contained in this Act or of
24 the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or
25 agency included in this Act shall be used for publicity or

propaganda purposes to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

~~SEC. 410. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—~~

~~(a) to not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;~~

~~(b) to positions filled from within the agency;~~

~~(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;~~

~~(d) to seasonal and casual workers;~~

~~(e) to meat inspectors;~~

~~(f) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2;~~

~~(g)~~ to field employees of the Soil Conservation ~~Service and Production and Marketing Administration who provide conservation assistance to farmers and ranchers.~~

~~*Provided further*, That when any department or agency covered in this Act has reduced their employment rolls to 80 per centum of the total number on their rolls as of July 1, 1951, this limitation may cease to apply.~~

SEC. 409. In order to effect reductions in appropria-

1 *tions for personal services equivalent to 10 percent or more*
2 *below the 1952 budget estimates, except for field operating*
3 *and research employees engaged in work of county offices*
4 *and other field locations, and except for the crop and livestock*
5 *reporting service, the following appropriations have been*
6 *reduced in the amounts indicated and obligations for personal*
7 *services shall not exceed the amount included in the budget*
8 *estimate less the amount so indicated, respectively, for each*
9 *appropriation:*
10 *Research and Marketing Act of 1946, $235,268.*
11 *Bureau of Agricultural Economics:*
12 *Economic investigations, $168,663.*
13 *Crop and livestock estimates, $17,696.*
14 *Agricultural Research Administration:*
15 *Office of Administrator, $45,560.*
16 *Research on agricultural problems of Alaska,*
17 *$18,450.*
18 *Research on strategic and critical agricultural ma-*
19 *terials, $33,580.*
20 *Office of Experiment Stations:*
21 *Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto*
22 *Rico, $12,990.*
23 *Salaries and expenses, $32,910.*
24 *Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics,*
25 *$111,670.*

1 *Bureau of Animal Industry:*

2 *Salaries and expenses:*

3 *Animal research, $215,671.*

4 *Animal disease control and eradication,*

5 *$186,978.*

6 *Marketing agreements, hog cholera, virus*

7 *and serum, $1,394.*

8 *Meat inspection, $48,012.*

9 *Bureau of Dairy Industry, $97,510.*

10 *Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry,*

11 *$585,949.*

12 *Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural*

13 *Engineering:*

14 *Plant, soil, and agricultural engineering re-*

15 *search, $370,670.*

16 *National Arboretum, $11,680.*

17 *Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine:*

18 *Salaries and expenses:*

19 *Insect investigations, $110,275.*

20 *Insect and plant disease control, $43,938.*

21 *Plant quarantines, $30,483.*

22 *Control of emergency outbreaks of insects and*

23 *plant diseases, $6,871.*

24 *Total, Agricultural Research Administra-*

25 *tion, $1,964,591.*

1 *Control of forest pests:*

2 *Forest Pest Control Act, $3,286.*

3 *White pine blister rust, $25,737.*

4 *Forest Service:*

5 *Salaries and expenses:*

6 *National forest protection and management,*

7 *$373,351.*

8 *Forest research, $278,897.*

9 *Total, salaries and expenses, $652,248.*

10 *Forest development roads and trails, $116,047.*

11 *Acquisition of lands for national forests:*

12 *Weeks Act, $897.*

13 *Special acts, $320.*

14 *State and private forestry cooperation, $65,959.*

15 *Cooperative range improvements, $1,159.*

16 *Flood control, $152,465.*

17 *Soil Conservation Service, $803,009.*

18 *Water conservation and utilization projects, $6,919.*

19 *Production and Marketing Administration:*

20 *Conservation and use of agricultural land resources,*

21 *$400,620.*

22 *Agricultural production programs, $335,138.*

23 *Sugar Act program, $93,941.*

1 *National school-lunch program, $132,509.*

2 *Marketing services, $248,135.*

3 *Commodity Exchange Authority, $58,928.*

4 *Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, $250,089.*

5 *Rural Electrification Administration: Salaries and ex-*

6 *penses, $455,602.*

7 *Farmers' Home Administration:*

8 *Salaries and expenses, $982,300.*

9 *Farm Credit Administration (direct appropriation),*

10 *$46,641.*

11 *Extension Service:*

12 *Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto*

13 *Rico, $20,255.*

14 *Salaries and expenses, $68,827.*

15 *Office of the Secretary, $199,082.*

16 *Office of the Solicitor, $231,010.*

17 *Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, $51,946.*

18 *Office of Information, $55,732.*

19 *Library, $58,763.*

20 *Removal of surplus agricultural commodities (perma-*

21 *nent appropriation—administrative expenses), $325,453.*

22 *Provided, That nothing in the foregoing shall be construed to*

23 *effect greater reductions than have been made in the indi-*

1 *vidual appropriation paragraphs in this Act: Provided fur-*
2 *ther, That not to exceed $3,047,079 of the funds appropriated*
3 *under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, shall be*
4 *available in the current fiscal year for personal services in the*
5 *Department of Agriculture in carrying out the purposes of*
6 *such Act, as amended, including marketing agreements and*
7 *orders.*

8 *Sec. 410. No part of any appropriation or authoriza-*
9 *tion contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensa-*
10 *tion of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the*
11 *number that would be provided by a ratio of one such em-*
12 *ployee to one hundred and fifteen, or a part thereof, full-time,*
13 *part-time, and intermittent employees of the Department and*
14 *its instrumentalities, cooperators and collaborators receiving*
15 *personnel services from the Department: Provided, That for*
16 *purposes of this section employees shall be considered as en-*
17 *gaged in personnel work if they spend half-time or more in*
18 *personnel administration consisting of direction and adminis-*
19 *tration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and*
20 *separation; job evaluation and classification; employee rela-*
21 *tions and services; training; committees of expert examiners*
22 *and boards of civil service examiners; wage administration;*
23 *and processing, recording, and reporting: Provided further,*

1 *That nothing contained in this section shall be construed as*
2 *permitting any increase whatever in personnel officers over and*
3 *above the number otherwise provided for in this Act.*

4 SEC. 411. This Act may be cited as the "Department
5 of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1952".

Passed the House of Representatives May 17, 1951.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk.

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

[Report No. 561]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

MAY 21 (legislative day, MAY 17), 1951

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JULY 21, 1951

Reported with amendments

tling the torrents of flood and disaster and destruction, I pay tribute to the chairman of the Committee on Public Works for his faithful, thoughtful, scholarly and able presentation of the over-all problem of flood control, with which we know he has been deeply concerned for many years. All of us, from Kansas, Missouri, and the surrounding area, which whether directly affected as yet or not, may later feel the impact of the onrushing waters, are particularly grateful to know that it is through the Senator's effort that, tomorrow, a group of Senators, members of the Public Works Committee, of which the Senator from New Mexico is chairman, and other Senators from the surrounding territory, are to be given an opportunity to go to see what is happening in that section of the country. We intend to go as far as we can, I understand toward the headwaters, and through the affected areas in Kansas and Oklahoma, so that we may view the situation at first hand and become better able to present effectively to the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriation, which is now considering these matters, the very vital and desperate need for additional funds for the purpose of completing plans which have been on the boards and under consideration for so long.

I wish to thank the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, who from the beginning of this disaster, has shown interest, concern, and anxiety, and who has applied himself to the doing of everything possible, not only for the people of the other States affected, but for the Nation as a whole.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Missouri. It is our hope that members of the Committee on Public Works may arrive in the affected area within the next few days.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee for the statement he has made to the Senate this afternoon on the flood-control problem we have in the Missouri River Basin, especially the area which has been affected in Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma.

I wish to join the Senator from New Mexico in paying tribute to the Corps of Engineers. When I was a Member of the House of Representatives, and of its then Flood Control Committee, I became familiar with the work done by the Corps of Engineers. That corps has done a splendid job.

Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to a report which we have just received from General Pick, a report which he has just given to members of the Subcommittee on Civil Functions of the Committee on Appropriations. The statement was made at an open hearing, therefore I am not violating a confidence in disclosing it.

General Pick gave us a statement of losses in the flooded area, as of July 17. The area flooded in Kansas was 1,074,000 acres; in Missouri, 926,000. That was as of July 17, and this is July 20. The flood waters in Missouri are now reaching their crest. In Kansas, 368,500 people were displaced; in Missouri, 150,000. The number of major bridges lost—and I am speaking of railroad bridges across large rivers and large highway bridges—was, in the State of Kansas, 17; in Missouri, none. In addition to that, Kansas lost about 3,000 smaller bridges.

The estimated loss of livestock in Kansas was 7,000 head; in Missouri, 9,000. This is a season of the year when livestock is usually grazing on the range, and therefore the loss was not so great numerically as it would have been otherwise.

With respect to railroad rolling stock, including tankcars, boxcars, and other cars, put out of service during this period, many of the cars having been damaged, many having been destroyed by the flood waters, the number in Kansas is estimated at 22,100 cars; in Missouri, at 65,000.

The flood losses, as estimated by General Pick and his splendid Corps of Engineers, in cooperation with State agencies, as of July 17, was, in Kansas, $736,000,000; in Missouri, $139,000,000. I thought that would be of interest to the Senate, and I appreciate very much the courtesy of the Senator from New Mexico in yielding.

AUTHORITY TO FILE REPORT ON AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL—LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am very hopeful that the full Committee on Appropriations will conclude its work on H. R. 3973, the agricultural appropriation bill, tomorrow. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the committee be given authority to report the bill during the recess following today's session, and also to file with the Secretary of the Senate notices of motions to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI, for the purpose of proposing amendments to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I might state that it is not intended to proceed to the consideration of the bill before Tuesday.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand that the Senator from Georgia has discussed this matter with the minority leader, and that he is willing to have the agricultural appropriation bill taken up on Tuesday.

Mr. RUSSELL. I so understood.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wonder whether the acting minority leader would have any objection to program of this kind: That, following a vote on the pending amendment, consideration of the pending bill be postponed until after the disposal of the agricultural appropriation bill, with a unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate on the pending Post Office-Treasury appropriation bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say to the majority leader that, as of this moment, I understand his program to be as follows: On Monday, he intends to ask for a call of the calendar of unobjected-to bills, and thereafter to permit speeches by any Senators who desire to make them, for as long as they may desire, but that no appropriation bill will be taken up on that day.

On Tuesday, after the preliminary matters are disposed of, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] will call up the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, and it is the idea of the majority leader to proceed with that bill until it is finished. At the conclusion of the consideration of the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, he suggests a unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate on the Post Office and Treasury appropriation bill. Is that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct. I should like to have a limitation of debate on the Post Office-Treasury appropriation bill. The bill has been considered today, and there are not very many amendments. We are anxious, of course, to complete the appropriation bills at the earliest possible time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan has three amendments now lying on the desk, and he has no objection to a limitation on debate. In fact, he always welcomes a limitation on debate, because it allows Senators to know when they are going to vote. It gives them an opportunity to look at the amendments and acquaint themselves with their merits or demerits.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When the unanimous-consent request is made, I should like to reserve the right to object.

Mr. McFARLAND. I shall make the request so that the distinguished Senator may object.

I ask unanimous consent that immediately after the vote on the pending amendment, the consideration of the Post Office-Treasury appropriation bill be postponed until after the disposal of the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill; that the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill be made the pending business beginning next Tuesday at 12 o'clock; that debate on the pending bill, Post Office and Treasury appropriation, be limited, after disposal of the pending amendment, to 30 minutes on each amendment, the time to be divided equally between the proponents of the amendment and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], if he is opposed to the amendment, and if he is not opposed to the amendment, then the time for the opponents to be controlled by the minority leader; that the debate upon the bill be limited to 1 hour, to be divided equally between the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the minority leader [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—there should be a provision as to germaneness added to the request.

Mr. McFARLAND. I shall be glad to add that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is unnecessary. The rule requires that all amendments to an appropriation bill shall be germane.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have talked to Senators on my side of the aisle and have found no objection to the unanimous-consent request, with the understanding, on behalf of the minority leader, that consideration shall not be continued into a night session.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator refer to the limitation on debate?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not think night sessions are necessary when we have a limitation on debate; but we might want to continue in session until 6 or 7 o'clock. I think the bill can be disposed of very quickly. I have no intention of holding any night sessions if the Senate can make sufficient progress without holding them. If we work until 6 or 7 o'clock, and sometimes until 8 o'clock, I believe we can dispose of our business. But we must work diligently.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I have stated, I will agree to the unanimous-consent request with the understanding that we shall not run into a night session.

Mr. McFARLAND. So far as the completion of the pending bill is concerned, on no evening will we run later than 7 o'clock.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I quite approve of the intention of the eminent majority leader not to have a roll call after the vote on the pending amendment, because it is the practice of a great many Senators, particularly those who live along the Atlantic seaboard, to leave on Friday afternoon.

I similarly approve of the desire of the eminent majority leader to call the calendar on Monday and to resume work on the appropriation bills on Tuesday. The only question that comes to my mind is, Why, on Tuesday, should we set aside the pending business, the Post Office and Treasury appropriation bill, and take up the Agriculture appropriation bill, only to return to the Post Office-Treasury bill after the Agriculture appropriation bill has been concluded?

Mr. McFARLAND. I shall explain to the Senator; but, first, I want the unanimous-consent request to include motions and appeals.

The reason for the action suggested is that it will accommodate Senators who have amendments pending. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] tells me he cannot be present on Tuesday.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It so happens that the Senator from Illinois is in a similar position. It is his hope that it will be possible to offer some amendments to the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill providing for some decreases in it. I do not want to be estopped from doing that. I think that such efforts as I am able to make respecting the Post Office-Treasury appropriation bill may be largely disposed of this afternoon.

I shall be away on Tuesday, and I should like to have the opportunity of presenting amendments to the Agriculture appropriation bill. But I should be much happier if we proceeded with the Post Office-Treasury appropriation bill on Tuesday and with the Agriculture appropriation bill on Wednesday, or remain here tonight and finish the pending bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. When we endeavor to make unanimous-consent agreements and try to accommodate Senators, we find it is a very difficult thing to do.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I know it is. I hope the Senator from Arizona, in addition to his proper concern for the Senator from Michigan, will also take into consideration the position of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do; and I want to say that the distinguished Senator from Illinois has been very dutiful in his attendance on the floor of the Senate. I should think that if there is any particular amendment the Senator wants to propose to the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, it could go over until Wednesday.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If such an arrangement can be made, that amendments which I shall present—and I shall not present too many of them—can be considered on Wednesday, I shall be very glad to agree to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill is not really involved in the unanimous-consent request. I should think it would be most unusual if we concluded the bill on Tuesday. I am hopeful that we may conclude it by Wednesday afternoon. I do not know what amendments the Senator from Illinois has in mind. If they are amendments to the bill, he will undoubtedly have an opportunity to offer them on Wednesday. But without any knowledge as to the amendments he might propose to committee amendments, I do not know how we can make any progress at all with the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the comment of the Senator from Georgia. In order that I may lay all my cards on the table, insofar as the bill as passed by the House is concerned, I intended to offer an amendment reducing by half the bonus payments to farmers which are disguised as payments for using phosphate and lime. I do not want to enter into an argument, but the bulk of the farmers are doing it, anyway, and it is unnecessary for the Government to pay such large sums for sound practices during a period of economic stringency caused by the Korean War. That is an amendment which would save, on the basis of the House figures, approximately $128,000,000.

But naturally I wish to see the recommendations and bill presented by the Senate committee. This will be necessary before I can decide on the precise amendments I shall want to offer. I have to be out of town on Monday and Tuesday because of certain developments in the city of Chicago.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, if my colleague feels any misgivings as to whether or not that kind of an amendment will be offered, I can assure him that if he does not offer it I shall offer it, and my amendment will probably provide for a larger cut than may be asked in the amendment he may offer.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the assurance my colleague is giving in this matter, and I welcome it very much, but naturally, as great as is my esteem for him, I hope that I may be put in the position where I may offer it myself.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the Senator yield, if he has the floor? I was rather of the opinion that I had the floor at some stage of the proceedings.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. RUSSELL. I seek the opportunity to speak so I may say what a wonderful thing it is for brethren to dwell together in unity. It is an inspiring sight to see the two Senators from Illinois, as two souls with but a single thought, two hearts that beat as one, so far as the particular amendment referred to is concerned. I shall not debate the merits of the proposition at this time. I shall be glad to have such an amendment go over until Wednesday.

I may say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that some of those who have been on the Senate Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations have held a rather different view from that which he expresses with respect to the soil conservation program. So far as the Senator from Georgia is concerned, I am earnestly hopeful that the bill as reported to the Senate will contain an appropriation of at least $280,000,000 for the important function of conserving the soil and producing the crops necessary to enable the country to survive. But, in order to accommodate both Senators from Illinois, I am very glad to state that I shall ask that the item relating to the soil conservation program go over until Wednesday, in order that they may have due notice and may have ample opportunity to present any amendments they desire to present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND]?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Just a moment, Mr. President. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Georgia, which is characteristic of the way in which he always conducts himself on and off the floor of the Senate, with complete politeness and consideration for others.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is not said in any conventional sense at all. The Senator from Georgia does not need any praise from the Senator from Illinois; but I want him to know that we of the North appreciate his perfect gentlemanliness on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator, and I hope he will not repeat that statement on Wednesday, because I do not wish to have the Senator making state-

ments that are likely to cause me to deviate, by one iota, from my course in attempting to further a program which I believe to be of utmost importance to the farmers of the country.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Georgia is a very doughty fighter, but he is a completely fair fighter, and we love him and respect him for it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I may say, now that the gentilities are over for the time being, that while I appreciate the offer to have one amendment considered on Wednesday, there are also several other amendments which it is quite possible I shall offer, but not knowing the nature of the bill which the committee will report, I should appreciate it if the Senator from Georgia will continue his politeness and permit me to offer additional amendments on Wednesday, and not restrict me merely to the one amendment dealing with bonus payments for phosphates.

Mr. RUSSELL. I had begun to feel natural when the Senator from Illinois said the gentilities were over, and I was preparing to enter into the fight, but since the Senator again mentions amendments he desires to offer, I may say that I would estimate there are some 70 or 80 amendments to the bill. I hope the Senate may proceed on Tuesday to take action on as many of them as it can, without interfering with the plans of the Senator from Illinois to visit his own State. If the Senator from Illinois would indicate the amendments in which he is interested, I can assure him that it will not enable me to take any unfair advantage of him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sure the Senator from Georgia would not do that. But not knowing the nature of the Senate committee recommendations in the bill, I cannot mention the specific items, but I can promise that I shall restrict myself to not more than 10 amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to say to my old friend from Georgia that the proposals I have in mind by way of amendments to the agricultural appropriation bill will not be new. I have offered them years ago. I have fought, bled, and died with the Senator from Georgia across the committee table and in conference, and he knows of the struggle, which has been carried on to make cuts in the agricultural appropriations. This is simply a resumption of that struggle which is based upon a deep conviction on the part of the junior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to bear testimony to the complete consistency of the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois is undertaking to eliminate the soil-conservation payments. He was a distinguished member of the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations for a number of years. It was my privilege to meet him in conference. He is a tough and doughty fighter, and he has certainly distinguished himself for the efficiency with which he has attacked this program.

I well remember back in the days of the Eightieth Congress, when the distinguished Senator from Illinois was then the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, and so far as the House of Representatives was concerned, he succeeded in his purpose. He managed to secure the approval of the House of Representatives to an amendment which absolutely eliminated the soil-conservation program from the farms of the United States. After a long and bitter struggle, the Senate committee finally made a very modest restoration—it was almost a token appropriation—of $150,000,000.

A great many of the farmers did not agree with the distinguished Senator from Illinois. They believed in conserving the soils of the Nation. I think the farmers generally now have a very keen sense of responsibility to the generations that will come after them. The practices are different in some States from those in others. The farmers of Illinois may not have practices of which farmers in other States approve. But in most of the States of the Union the farmers do wholeheartedly embrace and approve of this program.

It is my own personal view, without bringing any politics into the discussion, that the result of the elections held in 1948 in the great farm States—for example, Iowa—which are usually as rockbound in their Republicanism as is the State of Georgia in its Democracy, was a very concrete demonstration of the disapproval of the farmers of America of destroying the agricultural-conservation program.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND]?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I object until we can reach an agreement on the number of amendments that can be offered on Wednesday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Which request is now before the Senate, that of the Senator from Georgia or that of the Senator from Arizona?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request of the Senator from Georgia was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand that, without objection, the request I made as to reporting the bill was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That was agreed to. There was no objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia for permission to report the bill. The question now is on the request of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to say——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will say that the Senator that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has already objected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I will withdraw my objection provided I can have an assurance from the Senator from Georgia that a limited number of amendments can be offered on Wednesday and debated and voted upon. The word of the Senator from Georgia will be completely good, without agreement being entered into upon the floor of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to be as generous and gracious as possible. I want to measure up as nearly as I can to the very high standard attributed to me by the Senator from Illinois. But it is very difficult for me to buy a pig in a poke. I have no idea what amendments are involved. I do not know wheher the Senate can afford to take any action whatever on any amendment on Tuesday, because it might relate to some item in the appropriation bill in which the Senator from Illinois is interested. I shall be very happy, if the Senator will supply me with a list of the specific items in the bill in which he is interested, to ask that action on those items be carried over.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have not seen the bill, and therefore I cannot buy a pig in a poke either.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have great sympathy with the Senator. I can understand why he might want to go to his home State. I have suffered with judgeship troubles of my own, and I know something about the difficulties which confront us.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. CAPEHART. There is. I object.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I would withdraw my objection——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana has already objected, so it is not necessary to withdraw anything.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment on page 15, line 15. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. KILGORE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment on page 15, line 15.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I renew the unanimous-consent request which I made before the quorum call started.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am not familiar with the request. What is it? Reserving the right to object, I want to know what the request is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona will restate it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well. I will restate it.

The unanimous-consent request was that, after the vote on the pending amendment, consideration of the pending bill be postponed until after the disposition of the agricultural appropriation bill; that the agricultural appropriation bill be made the pending business beginning on Tuesday; that there be a limitation of debate of 30 minutes on each amendment, motion, or appeal, and a limitation of an hour on the Post Office-Treasury appropriation bill.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That immediately after the vote on the pending amendment proposed by Mr. DOUGLAS to H. R. 3282, the Treasury and Post Office Departments Appropriation Act, 1952, the further consideration of the said bill be postponed until after the disposition of H. R. 3973, the Agricultural Department Appropriation Act, 1952; that the latter bill be made the pending business for Tuesday, July 24, 1951, at the hour of 12 o'clock noon; that during the further consideration of H. R. 3282, the Treasury and Post Office Departments Appropriation bill, 1952, debate upon any amendment or motion (including appeals) shall be limited to not exceeding 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled, in the case of committee amendments, by Mr. KILGORE and Mr. WHERRY, respectively, or some Senator designated by him; and, in the case of individual amendments or motions, by the mover of any such amendment or motion and Mr. KILGORE, respectfully: *Provided*, That in the event Mr. KILGORE is in favor of any such individual motion or amendment, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by Mr. WHERRY, or some Senator designated by him.

Ordered further, That debate on the question of the final passage of H. R. 3282 shall be limited to not exceeding 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. KILGORE and Mr. WHERRY, or some Senator designated by him.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, before the consideration of the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill is resumed, and the vote is taken on the DOUGLAS amendment, I should like to ask the major leader a question. Under the understanding to take up the agricultural appropriation bill on Tuesday, if for any reason the agricultural appropriation bill cannot be reported tomorrow, in accordance with the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], at least 24 hours should be given to Senators to look over the bill after it is reported. So if the bill is not reported on Saturday, but is reported on Monday, the understanding about taking it up on Tuesday would have to be changed. Do I make myself clear?

Mr. McFARLAND. There would still be a period of 24 hours.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the bill were reported on Monday it would be in order to take it up on Tuesday.

Mr. McFARLAND. It would still lie over 24 hours.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So long as there is a period of 24 hours——

Mr. McFARLAND. It would lie over for 24 hours. Of course, it is understood that the other conditions in the unanimous-consent request, with respect to the division of time, also apply. In restating the request I briefed it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In other words, there will be a period of 24 hours after the bill is printed, for Members to consider it before it is taken up. As I stated to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] in the corridor, if for any reason the bill should not be reported tomorrow, in accordance with his request, at least 24 hours should be given as was the case with the Treasury and Post Office bill, for Senators to examine it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is the Senator referring to the agricultural appropriation bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should be glad to allow that period of time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, that may complicate the situation——

The VICE PRESIDENT. That provision was not included in the unanimous-consent agreement, which has already been entered. But if the bill is reported on Monday, under the rule it will be in order to take it up on Tuesday, even without a unanimous-consent agreement. It must lie over 1 day.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand that, but in the interest of the minority I simply wanted, as was the case with the Treasury and Post Office bill, to give Senators sufficient notice. If every Senator feels that he has sufficient notice, I have no objection to taking up the agricultural appropriation bill on Tuesday.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am very hopeful that we shall be able to conclude consideration of the bill in the committee tomorrow.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3282) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment on page 15, line 15. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] has a general pair on this vote with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay," and the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] who is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations, has a general pair on this vote with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON].

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent. If present and voting the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate began work on Treasury-Post Office appropriations.

Defense Production Act amendments bill passed by House, 323 to 92.

Bill providing for general revision of postal rates cleared for House debate by Rules Committee.

See Congressional Program Ahead.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 8697–8700

Bills Introduced: One bill and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1878; S. J. Res. 85; and S. Con. Res. 36. Page 8697

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H. R. 3911, lapel buttons for relatives of servicemen killed in World War II or any subsequent war, with amendments (S. Rept. 558);

H. R. 385, directing the Secretary of the Army to convey a certain parcel of land to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y. (S. Rept. 559); and

S. 622, to provide for pay increases for Federal employees, with amendment (S. Rept. 560). Page 8697

D. C. Incapacitated: Conference was requested by Senate on S. 11, to conserve the assets of persons of advanced age, mental weakness, or physical incapacity; and Senators Pastore, Smith of North Carolina, and Butler of Maryland were appointed as conferees. Page 8699

Treasury-Post Office Appropriations: Senate worked on H. R. 3282, Treasury-Post Office appropriations for 1952, adopting a number of committee amendments, postponing action on committee amendment raising by $800,000 funds for general administration of the Post Office Department, and rejecting, by 28 yeas to 30 nays, Douglas amendment (to committee amendment on funds for postal operation) reducing by $36,100,000 figure covering this item. Among committee amendments adopted were those covering the items for the Treasury Department between pages 2 and 10 of the bill, on all of which Senator Ferguson was granted consent to offer, at a later time, amendments en bloc irrespective of their adoption today.

It was unanimously agreed that further consideration of H. R. 3282 be postponed until after passage of H. R. 3973, Agriculture appropriations, and that further debate on H. R. 3282 be limited, as follows: one-half hour on motions and amendments, and 1 hour on the bill, all equally divided. Pages 8700–8709, 8730–8731

Agriculture Appropriations: Committee on Appropriations was authorized to report H. R. 3973, Agriculture appropriations for 1952, during recess of Senate, and it was unanimously agreed that the bill be made the pending business of the Senate beginning Tuesday, July 24, at noon. Pages 8727–8730

Nomination: The nomination of Frank C. Nash, of D. C., to be assistant to the Secretary of Defense, was received. Page 8731

Program for Monday: Senate recessed at 4:29 p. m. until noon Monday, July 23, when it will call the calendar for unobjected-to bills.

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

APPROPRIATIONS—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee met in executive session to mark up for reporting to the full committee H. R. 4329, D. C. appropriations for 1952. It did not conclude and will meet again tomorrow.

APPROPRIATIONS—ARMY CIVIL FUNCTIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Continuing hearings on H. R. 4386, Army civil-functions appropriations for 1952, the subcommittee received testimony by Senators Underwood and Clements; Representatives Bates, Spence, and Golden; and a delegation of citizens from the areas affected, on various river and harbor and flood-control projects in Kentucky. Senator Kilgore and Representative Hedrick testified on lock No. 1 on the Big Sandy, W. Va.

In an afternoon session, the subcommittee heard Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of Corps of Engineers, make a report on the current Kansas-Missouri flood situation.

Hearings continue July 23.

APPROPRIATIONS—NAVY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Armed Services continued hearings on 1952 estimates for the various branches of the armed services, with Rear Adm. Charles W. Fox, SC, USN; Rear Adm. Edward W. Clexton, USN; Worth C. Wiley; and Capt. Frederic W. Hesser, SC, USN, all of Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, Department of the Navy, appearing in justification of budget estimates for the Navy Department. Subcommittee adjourned subject to call.

AIR FORCE PROCUREMENT

Committee on Armed Services: Preparedness Subcommittee, in executive session, heard the following two witnesses discuss various procurement matters, including a description of methods by which they are handled, and the various types of checks upon procurement that have been instituted by the Air Force: Eugene M. Zuckert, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, and Maj. Gen. Joseph Carrol, Director of the Air Force Office of Special Investigation.

INFLUENCE IN GOVERNMENT

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments: Special Investigating Subcommittee concluded hearings on this phase of its investigation on "alleged attempts to influence and bribe Government officials," after receiving testimony by Samuel D. Mason, who admitted that he had received money from various individuals to influence Government officials, but stated that he had never, accordingly, contacted anyone in the Government. Meyer J. Sawyer, Washington attorney, with whom Mr. Mason at one time had shared an office and had contact, stated that he knew Mr. Mason but knew absolutely nothing of his affairs.

Subcommittee is turning the files over to the Department of Justice for whatever action it deems essential.

TAX REVISION

Committee on Finance: The following witnesses testified on aspects of taxing cooperatives in connection with the committee's hearings on H. R. 4473, tax-revision bill: Wilfred E. Rumble, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives; F. V. Heinkel, Missouri Farmers Association, Inc.; Carl D. Loos, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives; Joseph J. O'Connell, Jr., National Tax Equality Association; Ralph E. Burgess, National Tax Equality Association; C. Emory Glander, Columbus, Ohio; Charles W. Holman, National Milk Producers Federation; W. C. Moore, Denver Milk Producers, Inc.; Donald P. Lloyd, Cooperative Food Distributors of America; Jerry Voorhis, the Cooperative League of America; and D. W. Brooks, Cotton Producers Association. Hearings continue July 23.

AIR-MAIL SUBSIDIES

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: The following two witnesses appeared before the committee to express their views on the seven pending bills to separate air-mail pay from subsidy (S. 1657, 436, 535, 1137, 1756, 1757, and 1870): C. E. Woolman, president, Delta Air Lines, and Stanley Gewirtz, representing the ADA. Hearings continue July 23.

VETERANS

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare: Committee met in executive session to consider, but took no final action on, (1) report of its special subcommittee on medical practices and policies in the Veterans' Administration; (2) S. 1864, authorizing payments by VA on purchase of automobiles by certain disabled veterans; and (3) the nomination of Martha M. Eliot to be Chief of Children's Bureau of the FSA.

INTERSTATE CRIME—ATLANTIC CITY

Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce: Committee concluded hearings on the gambling situation in Atlantic City, N. J., after interrogating the following witnesses on crime and corruption in that city and in the county of Atlantic, N. J.: Herman Orman, alleged racketeer boss, Margate, N. J.; Francis Smith, alleged racketeer and former bookmaker; Jack Portack, police officer; Jack Brancato and Benjamin Rubenstein (accompanied by Dorothy Mitchell), alleged racketeers; and Albert Phillips, policeman, all of Atlantic City, N. J.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: Seven public bills, H. R. 4896–4902; nine private bills, H. R. 4903–4911; and three resolutions, H. Res. 348–350, were introduced. Pages 8814–8815

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. J. Res. 82, relating to an amendment to the Rules of Civil Procedure regarding condemnation of property (H. Rept. 739); and

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 23 (legislative day, JUNE 27), 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. RUSSELL to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, viz: On page 50, after line 14, insert the following:

1 INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

2 The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and
3 directed to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit
4 Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury by canceling
5 notes issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the
6 Treasury in the amount of $76,808,000 for the net costs
7 during the fiscal year 1950 under the International Wheat
8 Agreement Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C. 1641–1642).

7–23–51——A

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. RUSSELL to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

JULY 23 (legislative day, JUNE 27), 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 23 (legislative day, JUNE 27), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. RUSSELL (for Mr. CHAVEZ) to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, viz: On page 41, after line 24, insert the following:

1 The unexpended balances appropriated for the purposes
2 of section 504 (a) of the Housing Act of 1949 by the Gen-
3 eral Appropriation Act of 1951, shall hereafter be available
4 for the additional purposes of making grants and the grant
5 portion of combination loans and grants for the purposes
6 of the Act of August 28, 1937, "to promote conservation
7 in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States by aiding
8 in the development of facilities for water storage and utiliza-
9 tion and for other purposes".

7-23-51——B

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. RUSSELL (for Mr. CHAVEZ) to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

JULY 23 (legislative day, JUNE 27), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 23 (legislative day, JUNE 27), 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. WILLIAMS to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 31, line 15, strike out "$280,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$150,000,000".

On page 33, line 1, strike out "$280,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$150,000,000".

7-23-51——C

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. WILLIAMS to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

JULY 23 (legislative day, JUNE 27), 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1879. A bill for the relief of Ernest Nanpei Ihrig; and

S. 1880 (by request). A bill for the relief of Donald R. Dyson and Kenneth M. Dyson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 1881. A bill to eliminate compensation of members of the Armed Forces of the United States from taxable income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SMITH of North Carolina:

S. 1882. A bill to provide for the granting of an easement for a public road through the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge in Dare County, North Carolina; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 1883. A bill to establish a Missouri Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Missouri River, its tributaries and watershed, to prevent floods, reclaim and irrigate lands, encourage agriculture, stimulate industrial expansion, develop low-cost hydroelectric power, promote navigation, increase recreational possibilities, protect wildlife, strengthen the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 1884. A bill for the relief of Judson T. Ortman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN HEARINGS OF FINANCE COMMITTEE RELATING TO REVENUE

Mr. MILLIKIN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 179), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That 800 additional copies of part 1 and of each subsequent part of the hearings held before the Committee on Finance on (H. R. 4473) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, be printed for the use of said committee.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. RUSSELL submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 3 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 50, after line 14, insert the following:

"INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

"The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury by canceling notes issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury in the amount of $76,808,000 for the net costs during the fiscal year 1950 under the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C. 1641-1642)."

Mr. RUSSELL also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3973, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. RUSSELL (for Mr. CHAVEZ) submitted the following notice in writing:

The notice of Mr. CHAVEZ is as follows:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 41, after line 24, insert the following:

"The unexpended balances appropriated for the purposes of section 504 (a) of the Housing Act of 1949 by the General Appropriation Act of 1951, shall hereafter be available for the additional purposes of making grants and the grant portion of combination loans and grants for the purposes of the act of August 28, 1937, 'To promote conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States by aiding in the development of facilities for water storage and utilization and for other purposes.'"

Mr. RUSSELL (for Mr. CHAVEZ) also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. CHAVEZ to House bill 3973, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Brig. Gen. Claude Henry Chorpening, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army), for appointment as Assistant to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and as brigadier general in the Regular Army of the United States, and withdrawing the nomination of Mrs. Rufina W. Gully to be postmaster at Gholson, Miss., which nominating message was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Martha M. Eliot, of Connecticut, to be Chief of the Children's Bureau, Federal Security Agency, vice Katharine F. Lenroot, retired.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Address entitled "Crime in America: Its Effect on Foreign Relations," delivered by him at Columbia University on July 10, 1951.

Address entitled "New Atlantic Agreement Needed," delivered by Senator GILLETTE at the Atlantic Union Strategy Conference, Washington, D. C., May 18, 1951.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

Editorial on the death of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, published in the Washington Evening Star of Monday, July 23, 1951.

By Mr. LANGER:

Editorial entitled "Rewriting the Constitution," published in the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune of July 13, 1951.

Article entitled "Writer Explains Why Pick-Sloan Plan Won't Work," written by Richard Baumhoff, of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and published in the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Leader of July 19, 1951.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

Article entitled "Bonus Riot of 1932 Back in News," published in the Washington Post of July 22, 1951; also article entitled "Secret Testimony of Commie on Bonus March Made Public," published in the Washington Times-Herald of July 14, 1951.

By Mr. THYE:

Article entitled "Forestry's Challenge to America," published in the Grand Rapids Herald-Review of July 19, 1951, relating to award to the Chippewa National Forest and its management for most distinguished accomplishment.

By Mr. KILGORE:

Article by James Euchner entitled "Highway Would Honor Claudius Crozet," published in the Sunday magazine of the Richmond Times-Dispatch of July 15, 1951.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Article by Philip W. Porter, relating to Government controls, published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of July 14, 1951.

Article by George E. Sokolski, entitled "UN and Press," published in the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune of July 16, 1951.

Editorial entitled "Covenant on Human Rights," published in the Palladium-Item and Sun-Telegram of Richmond, Ind., of July 20, 1951.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Article entitled "The Faith of an American," by Edgar Rogie Clark.

Article entitled "New Hope for the Seaway," published in the Economist of April 21, 1951, regarding the St. Lawrence seaway.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION AND HOUSING AND RENT ACTS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1717) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1956 and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, together with a message from the House insisting upon its amendment and requesting a conference with the Senate thereon:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 1717) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, do pass with the following amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That this act may be cited as the "Defense Production Act Amendments of 1951."

"TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

"PRIORITIES AND ALLOCATIONS

"SEC. 101. (a) Section 102 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (Public Law 774, 81st Cong.) is amended by striking out the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following sentences: 'In making such designations the President may prescribe such conditions with respect to the accumulation of materials in excess of the reasonable demands of business, personal, or home consumption as he deems necessary to carry out the objectives of this act. This section shall not be construed to limit the authority contained in sections 101 and 704 of this act.'

"(b) Title I of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is hereby amended by adding the following section:

"'That import controls of fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, and soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products and coconuts and coconut products), peanuts, butter, cheese, and other dairy products, and rice and rice products are necessary for the protection of the essential security interests and economy of the United States in the existing emergency in international relations, and no imports of any such commodity or product shall be admitted to the United States until after June 30, 1953, which would (a) impair or reduce the domestic production of any such commodity or product below present production levels, or below such higher levels as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary in view of domestic and international conditions, or (b) interfere with the orderly domestic storing and marketing of any such commodity or product, or (c) result in any unnecessary burden or expenditures under any Government price-support program.'

"(c) Section 101 of the Defence Production Act of 1950 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'No restriction, quota, or other limitation shall be placed upon the quantity of livestock which may be slaughtered or handled by any processor.'

"AUTHORITY TO REQUISITION AND CONDEMN

"SEC. 102. (a) Title II of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by adding to the heading thereof the words 'and condemn.'

"(b) Section 201 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended—

"(1) By adding at the end of subsection (a) the following new sentence: 'No real property shall be acquired under this subsection.'

"(2) By adding after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"'(b) Whenever the President deems it necessary in the interest of national defense, he may acquire by purchase, donation, or other means of transfer, or may cause proceedings to be instituted in any court having jurisdiction of such proceedings to acquire by condemnation, any real property, including facilities, temporary use thereof, or other interest therein, together with any personal property located thereon or used therewith, that he deems necessary for the national defense, such proceedings to be in accordance with the act of August 1, 1888 (25 Stat. 357), as amended, or any other applicable Federal statute. Before condemnation proceedings are instituted pursuant to this section, an effort shall be made to acquire the property involved by negotiation unless, because of reasonable doubt as to the identity of the owner or owners, because of the large number of persons with whom it would be necessary to negotiate, or for other reasons, the effort to acquire by negotiation would involve, in the judgment of the President, such delay in acquiring the property as to be contrary to the interest of national defense. In any condemnation proceeding instituted pursuant to this section, the court shall not order the party in possession to surrender possession in advance of final judgment unless a declaration of taking has been filed, and a deposit of the amount estimated to be just compensation has been made, under the first section of the Act of February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421), providing for such declarations. Unless title is in dispute, the court, upon application, shall promptly pay to the owner at least 75 percent of the amount so deposited, but such payment shall be made without prejudice to any party to the proceeding. Property acquired under this section may be occupied, used, and improved for the purposes of this section prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended. Prior to the acquisition of any real property, or interest therein, under the provisions of this section, for the use of the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, the Administrator, Director, or head of the agency designated by the President to administer the provisions of this section shall come into agreement with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives with respect to the terms of such prospective acquisitions.'

"(3) By striking out 'requisitioned' in the presently designated subsection (c), and inserting in lieu thereof 'acquired.'

"(4) By redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.

"EXPANSION OF PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY AND SUPPLY

"SEC. 103. (a) Section 303 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 303. (a) To assist in carrying out the objectives of this act, the President may make provision (1) for purchases of or commitments to purchase metals, minerals, and other materials, for Government use or resale; and (2) for the encouragement of exploration, development, and mining of critical and strategic minerals and metals: *Provided, however,* That purchases for resale under this subsection shall not include that part of the supply of an agricultural commodity which is domestically produced except insofar as such domestically produced supply may be purchased for resale for industrial uses or stockpiling, and no commodity purchased under this subsection shall be sold at less than the established ceiling price for such commodity, or, if no ceiling price has been established, the higher of the following: (i) the current domestic market price for such commodity, or (ii) the minimum sale price established for agricultural commodities owned or controlled by the Commodity Credit Corporation as provided in section 407 of Public Law 439, Eighty-first Congress: *Provided further, however,* That no purchase or commitment to purchase any agricultural commodity shall be made calling for delivery more than 1 year after the expiration of this act.

"'(b) Subject to the limitations in subsection (a), purchases and commitments to purchase and sales under such subsection may be made without regard to the limitations of existing law, for such quantities, and on such terms and conditions, including advance payments, and for such periods, as the President deems necessary, except that purchases or commitments to purchase involving higher than established ceiling prices (or if there be no established ceiling prices, currently prevailing market prices) or anticipated loss on resale shall not be made unless it is determined that supply of the materials could not be effectively increased at lower prices or on terms more favorable to the Government, or that such purchases are necessary to assure the availability to the United States of overseas supplies.

"'(c) If the President finds—

"'(1) that under generally fair and equitable ceiling prices for any material, there will result a decrease in supplies from high-cost sources of such material, and that the continuation of such supplies is necessary to carry out the objectives of the act; or

"'(2) that an increase in cost of production, distribution, or transportation is temporary in character and threatens to impair maximum production or supply in any area at stable prices of any materials,

he may make provision for subsidy payments on any domestically produced material other than an agricultural commodity in such amounts and in such manner (including purchases of such material and its resale at a loss without regard to the limitations of existing law), and on such terms and conditions, as he determines to be necessary to insure that supplies from such high-cost sources or processors are continued, or that maximum production or supply in such area at stable prices of such materials is maintained, as the case may be.

"'(d) The procurement power granted to the President by this section shall include the power to transport and store and have processed and refined, any materials procured under this section.

"'(e) When in his judgment it will aid the national defense, the President is authorized to install additional equipment, facilities, processes, or improvements to plants, factories, and other industrial facilities owned by the United States Government, and to install Government-owned equipment in plants, factories, and other industrial facilities owned by private persons.'

"(b) The presently designated subsection (b) of section 304 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by striking out the proviso in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '*Provided,* That the amount borrowed under the provisions of this section by all such borrowers shall not exceed an aggregate of $2,100,000,000 outstanding at any one time: *Provided, further,* That when any contract, agreement, loan, or other transaction heretofore or hereafter entered into pursuant to section 302 or 303 imposes contingent liability upon the United States, such liability shall be considered for the purposes of sections 3679 and 3732 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, as an obligation only to the extent of the probable ultimate net cost to the United States under such transaction; and the President shall submit a report to the Congress not less often than once each quarter setting forth the gross amount of each such transaction entered into by any agency of the United States Government under this authority and the basis for determining the probable ultimate net cost to the United States thereunder.'

"(c) Section 304 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is further amended by striking out subsection (c).

"PRICE AND WAGE STABILIZATION

"SEC. 104. (I) In the third sentence, following the colon, the word 'and' is inserted in place of the comma appearing after the word 'fluctuations' and all of the language succeeding the word 'transporation' is deleted.

"(II) After the third sentence as thus amended, insert the following additional sentence: 'In determining and adjusting such ceiling prices, the President may also consider general increases or decreases in profits earned subsequent to June 24, 1950, by sellers of a material or persons performing a service: *Provided,* That no decrease of ceiling prices shall be effected and no increase of ceiling prices denied on the sole basis of the comparative profits earned by sellers of a material or persons performing a service prior to and subsequent to June 24, 1950: *And provided further,* That no adjustment of ceiling prices for any material or

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed 74 bills on call of calendar.

House passed 12 D. C. bills and debated State, Justice, Commerce appropriations.

Senate Appropriations Committee, and subcommittee, approved Agriculture and D. C. appropriations bills.

House committee reopened hearings regarding Communist activities in defense areas.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 8818–8819

Bills Introduced: Six bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 1879 to S. 1884; and S. Res. 179. Page 8819

Bill Reported: One report was made as follows: H. R. 3973, Agriculture appropriations for 1952, with amendments (S. Rept. 561)—reported during recess July 21, 1951. Page 8817

President's Message: Received message from President transmitting President's Midyear Economic Report, which was referred to Joint Committee on the Economic Report. Page 8817

Bill Rereferred: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was discharged from further consideration of H. R. 662, a private bill, and it was rereferred to Committee on Armed Services. Pages 8845–8846

Defense Production: Senate agreed to a conference on S. 1717, amending and extending for 1 year the Defense Production Act of 1950, and appointed as conferees Senators Maybank, Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Capehart, Bricker, and Ives. Pages 8819–8826

Calendar Bills Passed: On call of the calendar, 74 unobjected-to bills, of which 44 were private, were passed, as follows:

Without amendment and cleared for President:

DAR property: H. R. 1899, to raise to $10 million the amount of property which the Daughters of the American Revolution may hold in the U. S.;

Spanish-American pensions: H. R. 315, uniform pension for Spanish-American War veterans;

Veterans' life insurance: H. R. 1072, to amend existing law so as to permit renewal by World War I veterans of expiring 5-year level-premium term policies of U. S. Government life insurance;

Veterans' pension: H. R. 3193, granting a $120 pension to veterans of World Wars I and II who need the constant aid and attendance of another person;

Veterans' pensions: H. R. 3549, to modify eligibility requirements for payment of pension to certain widows of veterans of the Civil War, Indian wars, and Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine insurrection;

Veterans' benefits: H. R. 4000, to permit World War II veterans to continue their term insurance;

Oregon land: H. R. 3018, to authorize conveyance to the city of Klamath Falls, Oreg., all right, title, and interest of the U. S. in certain lands in Klamath County;

Federal prisoners: H. R. 3455, to amend the U. S. Code relating to parole of Federal prisoners;

Sea lampreys: H. R. 2995, to increase the appropriation for investigations and studies on eradication of sea lampreys in the Great Lakes;

Navy vessel: H. J. Res. 67, to provide that the first Navy supercarrier shall be named the *James V. Forrestal;*

National Defense Act: H. R. 1200, to correct an error in Public Law 128 (80th Cong.) so as to clarify a reference to the National Defense Act therein;

Navy mess allowance: H. R. 1201, to fix the limits of the mess allowance on certain types of naval vessels on either a quantity or a monetary ration basis;

Highland Falls, N. Y.: H. R. 385, directing the Secretary of the Army to convey a certain parcel of land to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y.; and

Private bills: Twenty-six private bills: H. R. 1443, 3217, 598, 3002, 3708, 4165, 702, 783, 791, 1096, 1104, 1157, 1233, 1691, 1973, 2064, 2170, 2180, 2204, 2299, 2406, 2408, 2455, 3665, 3950, and 1834.

With amendment, to be sent back to House:

Flaxseed oil: H. R. 2192, to amend section 313 (b) of the Tariff Act regarding substitution for draw-back purposes in case of linseed and flaxseed oil.

Microfilm reproduction: H. R. 4106, to amend the U. S. Code to permit the introduction in evidence of photographs, microfilms, or photostats of original business records after the destruction of the originals;

Service uniforms: H. R. 2736, to set the amount of initial clothing credit made to cadets and midshipmen at their respective Service Academies;

Casualty buttons: H. R. 3911, to provide appropriate lapel buttons for relatives of servicemen killed in World War II or any subsequent war; and

Private bills: Two private bills: H. R. 997 and 629.

Without amendment and cleared for House:

Ship registry: S. 1704, relating to the transfer of ships to foreign registry;

Arkansas land: S. 1403, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer to the Department of the Navy certain property at Shumaker, Ark.;

Alien property: S. 302, to amend Trading With the Enemy Act relative to value of property which the Alien Property Custodian may return and conditions;

D. C. clerk fees: S. 1345, abolition of certain fees payable to clerk of U. S. District Court for D. C.;

Indian trust funds: S. 950, relative to extending time in which payments are to be made to members of tribes from trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation; and

Private bills: Four private bills: S. 1028, 1562, 426, and 462.

With amendment and cleared for House:

Congressional witnesses: S. 1390, to amend sections of title 18 of Code relating to reprisals against congressional witnesses;

D. C. school lunch: S. 1349, to establish a Department of Food Services in the public schools of the D. C.;

Federal prisoners: S. 1365, to assist Federal prisoners in their rehabilitation;

Overseas activities: S. 1166, to create a commission to make a study of the administration of overseas activities of the Federal Government;

Intergovernmental relations: S. 1146, to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations;

Migratory birds: S. 509, to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act (to provide 15 percent of funds for enforcement);

Electromagnetic control: S. 537, to provide greater security and defense of the U. S. against attack (to be cited as the Electromagnetic Radiation Control Act); and

Private bills: Twelve private bills: S. 367, 880, 76, 100, 121, 168, 269, 810, 1133, 1279, 83, and 1474.

Simple resolution adopted:

Indian tribe funds: S. Res. 147, to authorize the GAO to investigate certain matters concerning funds and securities of Indian tribes.

Bill postponed: S. 540 was indefinitely postponed.

Pages 8827–8845

Classification Act: On call of calendar, S. 621, to provide that compensation rates of employees under Classification Act of 1923 shall not be lessened because of the act of 1949 unless the duties and responsibilities of the position are reduced, was recommitted to Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Page 8829

Nomination: One Army nomination was received, along with withdrawal of one postmaster nomination. Page 8854

Program for Tuesday: Senate adjourned at 3:07 p. m. until noon Tuesday, July 24, when it will begin consideration of H. R. 3973, Agriculture appropriations.

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

APPROPRIATIONS—AGRICULTURE

Committee on Appropriations: On Saturday, July 21, the committee voted to report, with amendments, to the Senate H. R. 3973, Agriculture appropriations for 1952. As approved by the committee, the bill would appropriate $751,770,130, an increase of $34,474,897 over the House-approved figure of $717,295,233. The amount approved is $68,435,416 below the 1952 budget estimates.

APPROPRIATIONS—ARMY CIVIL FUNCTIONS

Committee on Appropriations: The following seven witnesses appeared before the Subcommittee on Army Civil Functions on funds for agricultural levees in the Missouri River Basin, in connection with the subcommittee's study of H. R. 4386, Army civil-functions appropriations for 1952: E. I. Myers, Miss Julia Duke, Byron Hinkle, J. B. Dillingham, C. L. Richardson, Morris N. Jones, and A. E. Adams, all representing the Missouri River Flood Protection Association. Hearings continue tomorrow.

APPROPRIATIONS—NAVY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Armed Services continued hearings on 1952 estimates for the various branches of the armed services, with Rear Adm. Charles C. Hartman; William S. Stock, Office of Chief of Naval Operations; Rear Adm. George L. Russel, JAG; Rear Adm. Milton E. Miles, Pan American Affairs; John H. Dillon, administrative assistant to the Secretary of the Navy; and Rear Adm. Edward W. Clexton appearing in justification of budget estimates for the Navy Department. Subcommittee adjourned subject to call.

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 24, 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Mr. BRIDGES submitted the following

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. FERGUSON to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 12, line 22, beginning with the figure "$10,589,730" strike out all down to and including the period on line 24 and insert in lieu thereof "$10,314,730"

7-24-51——A

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. FERGUSON to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

JULY 24, 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 24, 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Mr. BRIDGES submitted the following

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. FERGUSON to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 31, line 15, strike out "$280,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$275,000,000".

7-24-51——B

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. FERGUSON to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

JULY 24, 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 24, 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Mr. BRIDGES submitted the following

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. FERGUSON to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 33, line 1, strike out "$280,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$200,000,000".

7-24-51——C

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. FERGUSON to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

JULY 24, 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 24, 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. ANDERSON to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, viz: At the end of the bill add the following new section:

1 SEC. . For the purpose of carrying out the provisions
2 of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat.
3 765), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appro-
4 priated, in addition to all sums heretofore authorized to be
5 appropriated for such purpose, the sum of $4,000,000 to be
6 available only for access roads for the prospecting and min-
7 ing of uranium deposits and to remain available until ex-
8 pended: *Provided,* That the sum authorized by this section
9 shall be available for contract immediately upon the passage
10 of this Act: *Provided further,* That the roads authorized to

7-24-51——D

be constructed under this section shall be certified to the Secretary of Commerce as important to the national defense by the Secretary of Defense or such other official as the President may designate.

Calendar No. 532

82d CONGRESS
1st SESSION

H. R. 3973

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. ANDERSON to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

JULY 24, 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 24, 1951

Ordered to be printed

AMENDMENT

Proposed by Mr. DIRKSEN to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 29, line 9, strike out "$53,474,991" and insert "$40,600,000".

7-24-51——E

Calendar No. 552

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

AMENDMENT

Proposed by Mr. DIRKSEN to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

JULY 24, 1951
Ordered to be printed

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 24, 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. DIRKSEN to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 41, line 12, strike out "$110,000,000" and insert "$50,000,000"; and

On page 42, line 21, strike out "$28,150,000" and insert "$26,136,000".

7-24-51——F

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. DIRKSEN to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

JULY 24, 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 24, 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS) to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 33, line 1, strike out "$280,000,000" and insert "$150,000,000".

7-24-51——G

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS) to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

JULY 24, 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 24, 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. NIXON to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 47, line 1, in lieu of "$1,215,268" insert "$878,268".

On page 47, line 16, beginning with the word "and", strike out all down to and including "$611,128" in line 21, and insert in lieu thereof ", $286,128".

On page 48, line 11, before the period insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the preparation of part 2 of the annual report of the Secretary (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture), or for the payment of salary to any person engaged in the editing or preparation of such report".

7-24-51——H

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. NIXON to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

JULY 24, 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued July 25, 1951
For actions of July 24, 1951
82nd-1st, No. 135

CONTENTS

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate debated agricultural appropriation bill. Senate asked House to return bills to authorize study of overseas activities and intergovernmental relations. Senate committees voted to report bills for Joint Committee on Budget, and to eradicate poisonous weeds. House received conference report on independent offices appropriation bill. House debated State-Justice-Commerce appropriation bill.

SENATE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952. Began debate on this bill, H. R. 3973 (pp. 8902-10, 8927-9, 8932-7). Sen. Russell explained the bill and pointed out reductions in the Department over the last several years. Sens. Saltonstall and Benton discussed with him the disposition of surplus commodities. (pp. 8903-10.) Agreed to all committee amendments down to SCS except the one providing for construction of a EPISAE laboratory at Orlando, which was passed over for later consideration (pp. 8927-9). Sen. Cordon discussed the importance of providing adequate funds for FS timber-sales work (p. 8928). Debated an amendment by Sen. Dirksen to decrease SCS to $40,600,000 (Senate committee figure is $53,474,991, House figure and Budget estimate are $54,278,000)(pp. 8932-7). Sen. Anderson gave notice of intention to submit an amendment providing $4,000,000 additional for access roads to uranium deposits, and several other Senators also submitted amendments which they intend to propose (p. 8898).

2. REORGANIZATION. On motions by Sen. Ellender, asked the House to return for further Senate consideration S. 1146, to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and S. 1166, to create a commission to make a study of the administration of overseas activities of the Government (p. 8937).

The Expenditures in the Executive Departments Committee voted to report, but did not actually report, S. 913, to create a Joint Committee on the Budget and to change budgetary procedure in several respects (p. D668). Sen. Wherry inserted a Washington Star article analyzing this proposal (pp. 8937-40).

Sen. McClellan inserted a summary of the recommendations which were made to the Expenditures in the Executive Departments Committee during the recent series of hearings on amendments to the Legislative Reorganization Act (pp. 8899-901).

3. WEED CONTROL. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report with amendments, but did not actually report, S. 1041, to eradicate and control

poisonous weeds on range and pasture lands (p. D668).

4. NOMINATION. Confirmed the nomination of Martha M. Eliot to be Chief of the Children's Bureau, Federal Security Agency (pp. 8940-2).

5. FLOOD CONTROL. Sen. Kefauver and others urged that more attention be given to controlling floods at the points of development in the headwaters and discussed the contributions of TVA in this connection (pp. 8922-6).

6. SELECTIVE SERVICE. Sen. Langer asked that farm boys be released from military service temporarily to assist in harvesting the crops, particularly wheat (pp. 8929-30).

HOUSE

7. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952. Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 3880 (H. Rept. 753) (pp. 8945-8). The following are among the actions taken by the conferees:

The so-called Jensen amendment, limiting the filling of vacancies, and the so-called Ferguson amendment, providing for reductions of 5 percent in various appropriations for personal services, were both dropped from the bill by the conferees, and several of the specific limitations on personal services in the bill were dropped. The minority House conferees did not sign the conference report, stating that the elimination of these two amendments was one of the reasons for their action.

The amendments reducing annual leave to 20 days, making a 25% cut in funds for informational work, requiring each passenger vehicle purchased for replacement to replace 2 older vehicles, and prohibiting the employment of chauffeurs were reported in disagreement. The Senate amendment providing that the purchase and disposal of typewriters be in accordance with the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, and the amendment providing that Inland Waterways may mortgage its equipment to obtain additional funds for purchasing new equipment, were also reported in disagreement.

The conferees compromised the item for the Budget Bureau at $3,362,000 and removed the limitation of personal services, and accepted the House langague authorizing GAO to place additional persons in grades GS16, GS17, and GS18. $104,500,000 was provided for GSA, and the limitation on personal services was removed. The prohibition against use of GSA funds for dispersal of Government agencies was retained. The provision limiting the number of passenger vehicles which could be purchased by various agencies was removed and adjustments were made to cover this in the individual appropriations.

8. STATE-JUSTICE-COMMERCE-JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952. Continued debate on this bill, H. R. 4720, with most of the discussion centering on the Voice of America program and other activities of the State Department (pp. 8948-9003). Rep. Havenner, Calif., urged Congressional authorization for flood-control and power projects in the Missouri Basin (pp. 8979-80). Rep. Bentsen, Tex., urged appropriations to construct the Falcon Dam, claiming that Mexico will go ahead on her own if we fail to provide for the U. S. share of the construction (pp. 8996-8).

9. ALASKA DEVELOPMENT. Received from Interior Department a reconnaissance report on the potential development of water resources in Alaska (H. Doc. 197); to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 9004).

A-7090850, Hillmann, Madeline Margaret, or Madeline Margaret Deslauriers or Madeline Margaret Campbell.
A-3002122, Hing, Wong.
A-5806858, Hochstetler, Dora Lavina, formerly Beauchamp (nee Hennan).
A-5155143, Hodges, Alice Mary.
A-6809332, Hognestad, Eivind.
A-6464476, Hwa, Jesse Chia-Hsi.
A-6005042, Hyer, Clara Margarita Pichardo Mendndez.
A-4563952, Ikuta, Yasutaro.
A-7351260, Jackson, Evelyn Florence Cozens.
A-6659140, Jody, Boris Abel (Berelis Josidijo).
A-8014792, John, Chiang King, or John Chiang.
A-1578771, Johnson, Runar, or Runar Holmberg.
A-7130624, Johnson, Shirley Louise.
A-7427562, Joncs, Laurette Leduc (nee Marie Rose Laurette Leduc) formerly Laurette Albert or Theresa Albert.
A-4234799, Kato, Ikano (nee Ikeno Oishi).
A-5753373, Kato, Kiyoka, or Kazuo Sewaki.
A-3502326, Klass, Abraham, or Al Klass.
A-7178612, Krajian, Leon Sarkis.
A-7321673, Kuant, Moy.
A-4068320, Kuschak, Andrew.
A-5758329, Lamb, Eudora, or Dora Lamb (nee Spicer) formerly Harrower.
A-2280015, Le Blanc, Ann (nee Horan).
A-2003177, Le Blanc, Theotime Joseph, or Timothy or Tim Le Blanc.
A-7189111, Lettsome, Wilmoth Carigon.
A-7083207, Lettsome, Mera Celestina.
A-6509269, Lind, Jacob, or Jack Lind.
A-5368015, Logoski, Stefan (or Lagocki), or Steve Logoski Kozek.
A-3469815, Luena, Emilio Bieja.
A-5050110, Luena, Julia Bulan.
A-1027070, Malcolm, Vincent A.
A-6995850, Mantsios, Ellas Gregory, or Elias Mantsios (Mantziou) or Elias G. Mantsios.
A-5405314, Marcrum, Anna Engel Dorothea (nee Behrens).
A-7643414, Martin, Angel Elias Frias, or Angel Elias Frias.
A-7240851, Martinez-Gonzalez, Jesus, or Jesus G. Martinez.
A-5630368, Massengile, Irene Mary (nee Washington).
A-4694586, McCandlish, Sally (nee Levine), or Sally McCandlich or Sally Levy or Shana Levin or Levinaite.
A-6297954, Melki, Michael.
A-7197982, Mello, Maria Cremilde (nee Paiva).
A-2908187, Mercan, John, or Joseph Wolff.
A-2918041, Mercan, Teresa, or Wolff (nee Mandi).
A-7469521, Merritt, Antonia Maris Alamilla.
A-4250737, Mihailides, Pashalis.
A-5470214, Millington, Irene Christina.
A-3658224, Mirakian, Setrak, or Setrak Medzigian allas Sam Mirak.
A-7137595, Mitchell, James Alexander.
A-6728473, Moldovan, Rose (nee Steiner) alias Rose Weiss.
A-7203925, Moore, Flora Ann, or Flora Ann Gumbs.
A-7199007, Morales, Rosa Ydalia Morales (nee Rosa Ydalia Urena).
A-5214897, Morales-Gonzalez, Alejandro.
A-7576698, Morawetz, Kurt Otto.
A-7083004, Morawetz, Rita Chana.
A-5045368, Morello, Maria Losardo, alias Giovanna Lipari Scianca.
A-5569843, Morgan, Gladstone Jonathan, or Clanson Jonathan Morgan.
A-6481974, Mucino-Basurto, Carlos, alias Anthony Caloclche.
A-4399657, Muloski, Olga, alias Olga Casey nee Zawada.
A-6960419, Munkittrick, Ingrid, or Ingrid Gassner.
A-4775021, Nakamura, Yoshimitsu.
A-4200727, Nakanishi, Sadao, alias Shuichi Nakanishi.
A-7390065, Nedelkoff, George, or George Nedelkow.
A-6371198, Nencel, David.
A-7290480, Nielsen, Herdis Johanne (nee Frandsen).
A-5529231, Nimori, Kaoru, or Richard Kaoru Nimori.
A-3230840, Noi, Chew Yan nn Yan Noi Sung.
A-7279875, Ocampo, Emeterio Mendoza.
A-5981756, Olsen, Henrik Hjalmar.
A-4456624, Ono, Mokichi, or Frank Ono or Ichizaemon Suwa.
A-7178585, Ortiz-Hurtado, Juan.
A-6316251, Owen, Judith Elizabeth.
A-6738463, Papageorgiou, Nikolas.
A-6326776, Perez, Francisco, Doncel Castro, or Frank Castro.
A-4759367, Peters, Heinrich Hans Gustav Amandus.
A-9510098, Picking, Douglas Barnette.
A-6616615, Picquett, Daisy Veronica, alias Daisy Veronica Picquett (nee Riley).
A-6510549, Poplanas, Stella Maria.
A-7014398, Poy, Chiu Chong, or Poy Chew.
A-7131139, Phiu, Victoria, or Chiu Ying Ngor.
A-7274040, Prager, Fritz.
A-6794962, Pulos, Maria C. (nee Maria D. Constantinides).
A-4732580, Quijano, Alonso.
A-4365961, Quintas, Antonio, or Antonio Quintas Rodriguez.
A-3514174, Randell, Dora (nee Dura or Dora Miller).
A-3706549, Regus, Vasile (William Rabbitt or Rabit), (William Rubek).
A-6733682, Ritchey, Joseph Eugene.
A-7387475, Rivera, Lorenzo.
A-1019709, Rodl, Frank, or Antonio Sgambati.
A-6827904, Rodriguez-Hizon, Virgilio Lourdes.
A-6887561, Russak, Joseph Chaim.
A-4271890, Rychel, Jan, alias John Joseph Richel.
A-5505393, Schiller, Elsa (nee Elsa Vogt), or Elsa Johanna Schiller or Elise K. Schiller.
A-6881805, Schwarz, Hans, alias Hans Eisler.
A-7469769, Sciullo, Franco.
A-5716866, Seiler, Daniel.
A-2388433, Shee, Lew, or Lew Lan Hing or Heung or Mrs. Eng Hoy.
A-5319126, Siber. Steve.
A-3019138, Simandjuntak, Gerson, or Simandjunta or Saleh Bin Karim or Karim Bin Salley.
A-5383073, Siparl, Vilho.
A-1054569, Smarzik, George, or George Sivak.
A-5580914, Spano, Gaetano, or Clyde Spano.
A-5388930, Spencer, Giovanna, or Sheasby nee Srintz.
A-4141767, Stein, Ray (Rachael) (nee Rajacsky).
A-5214133, Stougaard, Carl Gorm Petersen, alias Gorm Stongaard.
A-5654060, Szumilas, Stanley, alias George Sokol.
A-7450707, Tait, Claude Anthony, or Claude Anthony Wang or Claude Anthony Wang Tait or Claude Anthony Francis Tait or Claude Antoine Wang or Claude Wang.
A-4329295, Takemura, Nobuto, or Nobuya Takemoto.
A-4350727, Tarca, Dante.
A-7390587, Thomsen, Bente Oda Fritze.
A-5528610, Tiner, Mevzat.
A-6992227, Tournay, Lucille Mariette.
A-3797250, Toy, Mark Dock.
A-7975407, Tsai, Ruby Wu, also known as Yu Kee Wu.
A-7414960, Tsai, Shih Hao.
A-7088876, Tschetschot, George.
A-3943703, Tsukimoto, Tadashi.
A-2031632, Hurley, John.
A-7367151, Vaggalis, Calliope (nee Taboulari).
A-5140372, Valarelli, Vincenzo Maria, or Vincent Valarelli.
A-5480405, Valerdi, Celestino, Belestino Valerdi.
A-1503992, Valsas, Steve, Alias Stayros Valsamidis.
A-3434019, Vavasis, Sam, or Apzirious Spiros Vavasis.
A-4916793, Velcich, Domenick.
A-7019494, Ventura, Ramon Daniel Garcia.
A-2118316, Visini, Maria.
A-4563997, Vrana, Stefan Josef.
A-3617564, Wakimoto, Matsue Kimura, or Matsue Kimura.
A-2096175, Wiltainoja, Katri Elisa (nee Lilja), alias Mrs. Katherine Brickson.
A-6063600, Wilson, Edna May (nee Cohen), formerly Holt.
A-5978523, Wilton, Christina Farquharson (nee Gill or Kimmel).
A-7145270, Wimmer, Lillian Rose, formerly Lillian Rose Duane, Lillian Rose Faulkner.
A-7598397, Wloszcewski, Stefan.
A-1809582, Wolff, Johanna Bernardina Hendrika.
A-6620719, Wu, Wan-Ching (nee Wan Ching Chiang).
A-1284194, Yirmibes, Orhan Osman, or Orhan Osman Yirmibesh.
A-6072730, York, Lourdes Lontoc Francisco.
A-3775141, Hsueh, Chao Wang.
A-2712354, Yu, Greta Yee-Tak.
A-5342956, Zehetner, Joseph.
A-5711151, Zito, Rocco.
A-6985302, Kayar, Sedat Arif.
A-7083504, Madeira, Luis Julio.

CITATION OF MARTIN ACCARDO FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I report favorably an original resolution citing Martin Accardo for contempt of the Senate, and I submit a report (No. 562) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 180) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Martin Accardo to answer a series of questions before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the southern district of Florida, to the end that the said Martin Accardo may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF JULIUS FINK FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I report favorably an original resolution citing Julius Fink for contempt of the Senate, and I submit a report (No. 563) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 181) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Julius Fink to answer a series of questions before the said special commit-

tee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Julius Fink may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF ABRAHAM MINKER FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I report favorably an original resolution citing Abraham Minker for contempt of the Senate, and I submit a report (No. 564) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 182) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Abraham Minker to answer a series of questions before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Abraham Minker may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF ISADORE MINKER FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I report favorably an original resolution citing Isadore Minker for contempt of the Senate, and I submit a report (No. 565) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 183) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Isadore Minker to answer a series of questions before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Isadore Minker may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF ALEX FUDEMAN FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I report favorably an original resolution citing Alex Fudeman for contempt of the Senate, and I submit a report (No. 566) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 184) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Alex Fudeman to answer a series of questions before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Alex Fudeman may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 1885. A bill for the relief of George A. Efron and his wife, Anna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 1886. A bill for the relief of Hisae Kuramoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1887. A bill for the relief of Mordechay Dinewitz; and

S. 1888. A bill for the relief of Roberto Campa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request):

S. 1889. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 1890. A bill authorizing the establishment and maintenance of additional national cemeteries; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for Mr. GEORGE):

S. 1891. A bill for the relief of Lubo Paskalovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1892. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Daniel Rhee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 1893. A bill to amend and extend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended; and

S. 1894. A bill to assist the national defense by authorizing the provision of housing at reactivated military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. HENNINGS when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1895. A bill to make funds allotted to Senators for clerk hire available for use for payment of toll charges on telegrams; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. LANGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 1896. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anni Franchina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BRIDGES (for Mr. FERGUSON) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. FERGUSON to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. NIXON submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3973, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3973, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 3973, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT

Mr. ANDERSON submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, the following amendment; namely, at the end of the bill add the following new section:

"SEC. —. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 765) as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to all sums heretofore authorized to be appropriated for such purpose, the sum of $4,000,000 to be available only for access roads for the prospecting and mining of uranium deposits and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the sum authorized by this section shall be available for contract immediately upon the passage of this act: *Provided further*, That the roads authorized to be constructed under this section shall be certified to the Secretary of Commerce as important to the national defense by the Secretary of Defense or such other official as the President may designate."

Mr. ANDERSON also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3973, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

Address entitled "No War—No Peace," delivered by him before a luncheon plenary session at the Colgate University Conference on American Foreign Policy, on July 22, 1951, at Hamilton, N. Y.

By Mr. GREEN:

Address delivered by Rear Adm. Donald J. Ramsey, United States Navy (retired), treasurer, Silver Users' Association, before the Mirror Manufacturers' Association, San Francisco, Cal., July 12, 1951.

By Mr. LANGER:

Address on the subject of the duty of eligible citizens to vote in national and off-year elections, by Harry L. Brumond, chairman of the Citizens' National Affairs Committee, delivered at the meeting of the executive committee, held at the Waldorf-Astoria, New York, N. Y., on July 23, 1951.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Correspondence between the President and Mr. C. Irving Guyer, of Springfield, Mass., regarding price controls, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

Article entitled "Containment Is Far From Enough," written by Barbara Ward and published in the New York Times Magazine.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

Letter dated July 16, 1951, addressed to him by Hiram Bingham, Chairman, Loyalty Review Board.

Article entitled "Anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union," written by Victor Lasky and published in the June 1951 issue of the National Jewish Monthly.

appoint standing committee chairmen on some other basis than seniority (Henderson, Stone).

6. Translate party platform pledges into legislation action (MULTER).

7. Give priority in legislative scheduling to implementation of party platform promises (Henderson).

PUBLIC RELATIONS OF CONGRESS

1. Have the Library of Congress make a study of the public relations of Congress, under auspices of Joint Committee on the Library (BENTON).

2. Televise public hearings of congressional committees (KEFAUVER).

3. Make committee hearings available to American people through radio and television (Wilcox).

4. Broadcast and televise important House sessions, via commercial broadcasting companies, subject to a code of ethics (H. Res. 62) (JAVITS).

5. Experiment with broadcasting and televising important debates (HELLER, HUMPHREY, MILLER).

6. Adopt a planned program of televising selected committee hearings, with a code of fair practice (S. Res. 106) (WILEY).

7. Broadcast and televise all sessions of both Houses and selected committee hearings via Nation-wide networks owned and operated by Congress (Sifton).

8. Provide facilities for making motion-picture films for use in television stations in home States (BENTON).

9. Arrange the sessions of Congress so as to have more frequent recesses (Walker).

10. Arrange for a regular congressional recess during the first of each Congress, from July 1 to September 15 (MCCARTHY, Minnesota).

11. Provide for adjournment of Congress during April, August, and September in odd-numbered years (H. R. 6180, 81st Cong., 1st sess) (CELLER).

12. Make the Daily Digest section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD separately available for public sale (Riddick).

13. Phrase the titles of bills and resolutions so as to summarize their objectives and contents (Riddick).

14. Include at end of each printed edition of a bill a digest of its objectives and contents (Riddick).

15. Print periodically a full history of legislation pending before both Houses (Riddick).

CONGRESSIONAL PROCEDURES

1. Arrange for a general revision of the standing rules of the Senate (MORSE, HUMPHREY).

2. Adopt a rule of relevancy in Senate debate (HENDRICKSON, LEHMAN, MORSE, DOUGLAS, HUMPHREY, HELLER).

3. Adopt an improved cloture rule in the Senate (Walker).

4. Provide for majority cloture on all matters before the Senate (S. Res. 41) (Morse, Humphrey, Gross (APSA), Heller, Loeb, Stone, Burdette).

5. Amend the Senate cloture rule (S. Res. 105) (Lehman and 10 other Senators, Loeb (ADA), Henderson).

6. Amend rule XIX of the Senate standing rules (re disorder in debate) so as to permit the Chair or the Senate to rule upon its violation (LEHMAN).

7. Hold committee meetings and Senate sessions on alternate days (Ferguson, McClellan, Morse, Sifton).

8. Vote by electricity in the House (Davis (Wisc.), Bennett (Fla.), Denton, Kefauver, Heller, Walker).

9. Vote by electricity in both Houses (Humphrey, Miller, Sifton, Stone).

10. Limit power of House Rules Committee over legislation which may be considered from the calendar (Walker).

11. Restore the "21-day rule" in the House of Representatives (Holifield, Heller, Loeb).

12. Liberalize the present House rule concerning the discharge of committees from further consideration of bills (Walker).

13. Reduce required number of signatures on House discharge petitions from 218 to 150 (H. Res. 59) (SABATH, HOLIFIELD).

14. Require House Appropriations Committee to hold open hearings (Stone).

15. Hold joint hearings on identical or similar bills (McClellan, Sparkman, Furcolo, Holifield, Multer, Riddick, Sifton, Walker).

16. Hold joint hearings on departmental appropriation bills (SALTONSTALL).

17. Abolish riders on appropriation and other bills (Walker).

18. Abolish or limit the practice of pairing (Walker).

19. Add the following sentence to the rule limiting the power of conferees (sec. 135):

"It is hereby expressly provided that this paragraph shall be deemed to include reports on measures where one House has struck out all after the enacting or resolving clause and inserted a substitute."

ADMINISTRATION OF CONGRESS

1. Establish an Office of Congressional Services to coordinate the housekeeping facilities of Congress and modernize methods of personnel administration (Heller, Burdette, Kammerer).

2. Modernize methods of office management (Kammerer).

3. Appoint a business manager to rationalize housekeeping services of Congress (Kammerer).

4. Abandon antiquated patronage system on Capitol Hill (Kammerer).

5. Improve facilities of Senate Office Building for radio and television (Wilcox).

6. Provide more adequate office space for Senate committees (Wilcox; and, for Senators, BRIDGES).

7. Improve labor-saving devices, mimeograph facilities, and restaurant services in the Capitol and Senate Office Building (BRIDGES).

8. Survey the facilities and needs of the Service and Duplicating Department of the Senate (Smith).

9. Increase telephone and stationery allowances for Senators (BRIDGES).

GEORGE B. GALLOWAY,
Consultant.

APPENDIX A

HEARINGS ON THE ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF CONGRESS BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

LIST OF WITNESSES [1]

Senators: WILLIAM BENTON, STYLES BRIDGES, FRANCIS CASE, EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, HOMER FERGUSON, RALPH E. FLANDERS, ESTES KEFAUVER, HERBERT H. LEHMAN, WAYNE MORSE, JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, JOHN J. SPARKMAN, ROBERT A. TAFT, JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

Representatives: CHARLES E. BENNETT, USHER L. BURDICK, EMANUEL CELLER, CHARLES B. DEANE, WINFIELD K. DENTON, FOSTER FURCOLO, CHET HOLIFIELD, JACOB K. JAVITS, KENNETH B. KEATING, EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, GEORGE MEADER, ABRAHAM J. MULTER, TOM PICKETT, EDWARD H. REES, DWIGHT L. ROGERS.

Former Members of Congress: William J. Bulow, South Dakota; Gerald P. Nye, North Dakota; Clarence F. Lea, California; John J. O'Connor, New York.

Others: Carter W. Atkins, executive director, Connecticut Public Expenditure Council; Franklin L. Burdette, professor and head, department of government and politics, University of Maryand; Donald C. Cook, chief counsel, Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee (presented statement of Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON); William L. Ellis, Chief of Investigations, General Accounting Office (accompanied by Robert F. Cartwright, Assistant Chief; Francis T. Matchett, Assistant chief; Taylor G. Addison, Assistant Chief; Investigations, GAO; Edward J. Roach Jr., Administrative Officer); Emery L. Frazier, Chief Clerk of the United States Senate; Ernest S. Griffith, Director Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress; Bertram Gross, chairman, committee on political parties, American Political Science Association; Elmer W. Henderson, director, American Council of Human Rights; Robert Heller, chairman, National Committee for Strengthening Congress; Dr. Arthur N. Holcombe, professor of government, Harvard University; Dr. Edgar Lane, instructor of politics, Princeton University; Francis M. LeMay, coordinator of information, House of Representatives; James Loeb, Jr., national executive secretary, Americans for Democratic Action; Allan H. Perley, legislative counsel, House of Representatives; Dr. Floyd M. Riddick, Senate editor, Daily Digest; Beardsley Ruml, chairman, business committee, National Planning Association; Paul Sifton, UAW-CIO national legislative representative; John H. Sims, legislative counsel, United States Senate; George H. E. Smith, staff director, Senate Republican policy committee; Mrs. Kathryn H. Stone, League of Women Voters of the United States; Gerhard Van Arkel, counsel, Senate Committee on the District of Columbia; Dr. Harvey Walker, professor of political science, Ohio State University; Francis O. Wilcox, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; Lucius Wilmerding, Jr., Princeton, N. J.; Dr. Belle Zeller, professor of political science, Brooklyn College, New York.

[1] References made to names not appearing on the above list are covered in written or oral statements submitted to the committee.

ADMIRAL FORREST P. SHERMAN

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the passing of the United States' Chief of Naval Operations and my good friend, Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, fills me, as I know it does every one of us, with a deep sadness. His death comes as a great shock to every American, and his loss is one beyond measure.

Forrest Sherman was born in Merrimack, N. H., but at an early age he moved with his family to Melrose, Mass., where he attended the public schools, and graduated at the head of his class from Melrose High School. He attended Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1913 and 1914, and was appointed to the Naval Academy from there. Born and bred in the tradition of the sea, Admiral Sherman throughout his 37-year naval career exemplified the very best that that tradition has represented ever since men have gone down to the sea in ships bearing the American flag.

Admiral Sherman's most recent assignment was a demanding one, requiring of him his every ability and energy—as Chief of Naval Operations, as a diplomat, and as a representative of the purpose and policy of the United States in an unsettled and worried world. I had the privilege of talking with him at length just before he left on this last assignment, and I felt again the glow of confidence and quiet courage which he always radiated. It is most fitting, even though it is terribly tragic, that Admiral Sherman should have died in line of duty, in a heroic effort to help bolster the defenses of this land he loved so well and of the free world in whose interests he had always fought superbly.

Mere words on the part of any one of us are of little avail in this time of crisis unless we are willing at the same

time, and as never before, to buckle down to the tasks and endeavors to which Forrest Sherman committed himself above and beyond the call of duty. The security of this Nation on the sea, in the air, and on the land must be our first and greatest objective, as it was his, for on that security the freedom of our own Nation and many other nations depends. In the name and in the example of the late Admiral Sherman, let us resolve now to do our duty as it lies compellingly before us toward the achievement of this goal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a somewhat more complete description of Admiral Sherman's life, as printed in the Boston Herald of Monday, July 23. I wish to call attention to just one portion of the article, namely, the part which refers to the fact that at the age of 12 Forrest Sherman was sailing with his grandfather on Buzzard's Bay when his grandfather died of a sudden heart attack, and Forrest Sherman then brought the boat ashore and called for help. His grandfather was also a man who loved the sea.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADMIRAL SHERMAN DIES ON EUROPE MISSION—UNITED STATES NAVAL CHIEF HAD HEART ATTACK

(By Arnaldo Cortesi)

ROME, July 22.—Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, United States Chief of Naval Operations, died suddenly of a heart attack in the Excelsior Hotel in Naples at 12:30 p. m. today. He was 54.

WIFE FLIES HOME

The body was shortly afterward taken aboard the U. S. S. *Mount Olympus*, which is anchored in Naples harbor and acts as temporary headquarters of Admiral Robert B. Carney, commanding the southern sector of North Atlantic Treaty Organization forces. It will remain there pending arrival of instructions from Washington.

Admiral Forrest Percival Sherman, who ran the United States Navy for 2 years until his death yesterday, was a Melrose boy who caught the fever of the sea from his grandfather, a salty old New Bedford whaling skipper.

One of six brothers who wore big brass during World War II, he aimed high, and early at the age of 8 when, so the story goes, he informed his parents he was going to be an admiral.

COMMANDED "WASP"

He exceeded his own ambitions, going on to win the Navy Cross for his heroic command of the ill-fated carrier *Wasp* in the Pacific, drawing the praise of Pacific Naval Chief Chester W. Nimitz as "the man who is responsible for winning the war in the Pacific," and finally vaulting into the Navy's top post, Chief of Naval Operations, in 1949.

Admiral Sherman was born October 30, 1896, at Merrimack, N. H., a descendant of John and Priscilla Alden and son of Frank J. Sherman, for many years chairman of the board of assessors in Melrose, who died about 6 years ago.

When he was a small lad the family moved to Melrose, and when he was 6 Forrest began summering with his grandfather, Capt. John Allen, of New Bedford.

He listened to the yarns of Captain Allen and his old whaling friends. The boy shipped as crew on the old man's 21-foot catboat on runs around Buzzard's Bay and became well steeped in the craft of the mariner and the lore of his calling.

When Forrest was 12 he brought the boat into dock unaided one day, tied her up, and called for help. His grandfather had died on board of a heart attack.

ATTENDED MIT

Young Sherman foreswore baseball as a waste of time, concentrated on mathematics, wireless, and boats, and stood at the head of his class at Melrose High when he was graduated in 1913.

He attended Massachusetts Institute of Technology for a year, then took competitive examinations for Annapolis, getting the appointment from Congressman Frederick S. Deitrick. It was touch and go for a while, he recalled many years later, because Deitrick was a Democrat and his father a Republican.

In 1917 he graduated from the Naval Academy, second in a class of 203, and was commissioned an ensign in June. Sherman was immediately assigned to naval forces in the Mediterranean during World War I.

He had decided by 1922 that aviation was the coming thing in the Navy, and thereafter held a variety of assignments, playing a considerable part in the defense planning prior to World War II.

It was during this period that he achieved the reputation as a trouble-shooter compromise expert which was to catapult him to fame after the war.

LAST TO QUIT SHIP

In September 1942, Captain Sherman was in command of the aircraft carrier *Wasp* when she was torpedoed by a Japanese submarine off the Solomons.

The *Wasp's* ammunition and gasoline were exploding and burning and the bridge was blistering with the heat. Sherman, in a brilliant maneuver, reversed the direction of the ship to contain the flames in the bow section, at the same time allowing space and time for 130 men trapped there to escape aft.

The *Wasp* finally sank, but about 90 percent of the crew were saved. Sherman was the last man to leave.

He then served as Chief of Staff to Admiral John Henry Towers, Commander of the Pacific Fleet Air Force, later as Deputy Chief of Staff to Fleet Admiral Nimitz, took part in the initial surrender conference with the Japanese at Manila and watched the formal surrender aboard the Missouri.

His war decorations included the Navy Cross, Distinguished Service Medal, Purple Heart, Legion of Merit, Honorary Companion of the Order of the Bath (British), Grand Cross of the Order of the Phoenix (Greek), and Commander of the Military Order (Italian).

AIDED IN UNIFICATION

In 1945 he was named Deputy Chief of Naval Operations and during the next 2 years he was the negotiator for the Navy when representatives of the Navy, Army, and Army Air Forces sought to produce a compromise bill for unification that would meet some of the Navy objections.

Admiral Sherman commanded the Sixth Task Fleet in the Mediterranean in 1948, a tough diplomatic as well as naval job involving the implementation of American foreign policy.

Sherman's reputation as a "flying admiral," coupled with his conviction learned from the success of coordinated operations in the Pacific during the war that a unified command in Washington was desirable and necessary, carried him to the limelight in 1949.

Admiral Louis E. Denfeld, the then Chief of Naval Operations, had been removed by President Truman for his outspoken criticism of top defense policies in testimony before the House Armed Services Committee.

Sherman, a vice admiral, was propelled over the heads of nine other admirals—including four full admirals—to succeed the ousted Denfeld. He restored morale to the Navy and the unification row cooled down.

BRILLIANT OFFICER

Commenting at his Westboro home yesterday on his successor's death, Admiral Denfeld said:

"He was one of the most brilliant officers we have had in the Navy in many years. He has done a marvelous job as Chief of Naval Operations. I am very sorry. I was very fond of him."

Sherman married Dolores Bronson of Pensacola, Fla., in 1923, and is survived by her and their only child, Ann.

He also leaves five brothers and a sister.

Lt. Col. Edward A. Sherman, the only one of the six brothers still living in Melrose, is executive secretary of the Massachusetts Commission for the Hoover Report.

Lt. Comdr. Kenneth Sherman, USNR, is superintendent of schools in Andover.

Col. Paul D. Sherman is commandant of the Marine Corps Barracks at the Boston Navy Yard.

Col. Frank J. Sherman is a Cleveland resident and soap company executive.

Lt. Comdr. Ernest L. Sherman, a former history teacher at Kimball Union Academy in Meriden, N. H., has been stationed in the Mediterranean with a home in London.

Miss Mary Sherman, the only girl in the family, is employed by a Boston brokerage firm.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I share the grief the Senator from Massachusetts has expressed in regard to the untimely death of Admiral Sherman. He was a brilliant and able naval officer. He was contributing mightily to our defense plans; and he died in Europe, while furthering our plans for the strengthening of the United States and its allies.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement of Friday, July 20, 1951, the Chair lays before the Senate, House bill 3973, the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the agriculture appropriation bill be dispensed with, that the bill be read for amendment, and that the amendments proposed by the committee be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The first committee amendment will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Department of Agriculture—Title I—Regular Activities—Research and Marketing Act of 1946," on page 2, line 4, after "(7 U. S. C. 1621–1629)", to strike out "$4,700,000" and insert "$4,850,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished majority leader if

it is the intention to complete action on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill today?

Mr. McFARLAND. We cannot complete action on it today for the reason that it was agreed that two or three amendments would go over until tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. It is not indicated in the unanimous-consent agreement as to what amendments are to go over until tomorrow. The only reason I rose to inquire is because of a colloquy which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD between the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the chairman of the subcommittee. We should proceed with the work of the Senate. On the other hand, I do not want to be in the position of not protecting some Senators who are absent from the Senate on official business inspecting flood conditions in the Middle West.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wish to assure the Senator from Nebraska that it is the intention to go ahead with the bill. However, I know that the distinguished Senator from Georgia will ask that the amendments which he agreed should go over may go over. The oral agreement which was entered into concerning them is just as binding upon him as if a unanimous-consent agreement had been entered into.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, can the Senator tell us which amendments are to go over?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, at the present time the only amendments the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] asked to have go over until tomorrow are those dealing with the appropriations for the Production and Marketing Administration for the purpose of making soil-conservation payments to farmers.

Mr. McFARLAND. Those are the only ones which it was agreed should go over at the time the colloquy took place.

Mr. RUSSELL. They are the only amendments which have been submitted to me. Both the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Illinois were anxious that those amendments not be acted upon today.

Mr. McFARLAND. Those are the only amendments which were discussed on the floor, are they not?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Illinois indicated that there are one or two other amendments he intended to propose to the bill, but I have no information as to the effect of the amendments nor the sections of the bill to which they relate.

Mr. WHERRY. I want the distinguished Senator from Georgia to understand that so far as I am concerned personally, I am ready to proceed with the bill. I sat in the subcommittee with the Senator from Georgia. In the interest of orderly procedure, I think we should proceed with the bill. As I recall, the Senator from Michigan mentioned in the colloquy which has been referred to, or else he mentioned to me privately, that he would offer three amendments. Two relate to the soil-conservation appropriation which has already been mentioned by the Senator from Georgia. Another one is on page 12, line 22, relating to the Bureau of Plant Industry, soils, and agricultural engineering.

If it is agreeable to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, may we not pass over those three amendments?

Mr. RUSSELL. What are the other two items?

Mr. WHERRY. One is on page 31, line 15, and the other is on page 33, line 1. They deal with the same subject matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. They are the two amendments I had agreed with the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Michigan should go over until tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. The third is on page 12, line 22.

Mr. RUSSELL. I had no knowledge that any Senator desired to have that amendment go over, but if the Senator from Nebraska desires it to go over, I shall not object.

Mr. WHERRY. I am only asking that it go over for the benefit of the Senator from Michigan. In the absence of a unanimous-consent agreement, I really do not have any right to do so. However, the Senator from Michigan talked to me about the possibility of offering an amendment to that committee amendment. For the benefit of the Senator from Michigan, I should like to ask that the amendment on page 12, line 22, be passed over. The Senator from Georgia knows about the other two.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to let that item go over until tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests that as the amendments are reached, if any Senator desires that an amendment go over he make such a request.

Mr. WHERRY. Aside from the three amendments referred to, the junior Senator from Nebraska does not ask that any other amendments be passed over. With respect to the three amendments, I wish the Senator from Georgia to know that I make the request that they be passed over at the request of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Frear	Kilgore
Anderson	Fulbright	Knowland
Bennett	Gillette	Langer
Benton	Green	Lehman
Brewster	Hayden	Lodge
Bricker	Hendrickson	Magnuson
Bridges	Hennings	Malone
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Martin
Byrd	Hill	McCarran
Capehart	Hoey	McCarthy
Chavez	Holland	McClellan
Clements	Hunt	McFarland
Connally	Ives	McKellar
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Millikin
Dirksen	Johnson, Tex.	Monroney
Dworshak	Johnston, S. C.	Moody
Eastland	Kefauver	Morse
Ecton	Kem	Mundt
Ellender	Kerr	Murray
Neely	Smathers	Underwood
Nixon	Smith, Maine	Watkins
O'Conor	Smith, N. J.	Wherry
O'Mahoney	Smith, N. C.	Wiley
Pastore	Sparkman	Williams
Robertson	Stennis	Young
Russell	Taft	
Saltonstall	Thye	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senators from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL and Mr. CARLSON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the measure which is before the Senate is the annual appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture. Last year I undertook to point out that the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture were substantially below the prewar appropriations. Without desiring to draw any invidious comparisons, I gave figures which indicated that the appropriations for all other departments of the Government had shown a substantial increase since prewar days. I offered the figures for the RECORD, and I shall do so again this year in dealing with the bill.

I have asked to have prepared some charts or graphs which would indicate the substantial reductions, not only in the over-all appropriations for the Department of Agriculture but in the total number of employees working in the Department, as compared with other representative agencies of the Government.

Mr. President, there can be little question that the agricultural appropriation bill, during a period like the present, is a defense measure. Greatly increased responsibilities rest upon the Department of Agriculture to step up the production of food and fiber essential for the use of our Armed Forces, our civilian population, and those associated with us in the defense of the free world from the threat of Communist aggression.

In World War II an agency known as the War Food Administration was cre-

ated for the purpose of stimulating increased production of agricultural products, as well as of enforcing all the many acts growing out of the war conditions, which were applicable to agriculture.

The Department of Agriculture for the year 1940 had total appropriations amounting to $1,414,000,000. The budget estimates for the fiscal year 1952 are $990,000,000. The bill as reported to the Senate by the Committee on Appropriations is approximately $35,000,000 below the budget estimates.

I should like to invite the attention of Senators to the graphs, which show the downward trend in the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture. I invite comparison with the appropriations for other departments, which appear on the charts, all of which show a substantial increase since the year 1940. In all fairness to the Department of Commerce, I believe it should be stated that a great part of the most recent increase in the Department of Commerce appropriations is due to the fact that the Bureau of Public Roads and the Maritime Commission were placed in the Department of Commerce about 2 years ago.

When we come to consider the number of employees, the disparity between the prewar conditions and the conditions today is all the more marked in the Department of Agriculture. As a matter of fact, the number of full-time employees in the Department of Agriculture is smaller by more than 13,000 in this year's budget.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. I could not hear what the Senator said. How many fewer employees?

Mr. RUSSELL. More than 13,000 fewer full-time employees and some 8,000 fewer part-time employees than were on the rolls of the Department of Agriculture in the year 1940.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. The graph shows the increase in the number of employees in other representative Government agencies. Without exception, all of the other departments have more employees on their rolls to perform the work of the departments than has the Department of Agriculture, when comparing this year's budget with the year 1940.

I bring this fact to the attention of the Senate because I feel that the great reduction which has taken place in the Department of Agriculture, as distinguished from the other agencies of Government, places the Department of Agriculture in a somewhat special category when it comes to consideration of amendments reducing the appropriations which are recommended to the Senate by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. President, I shall not at this stage of the discussion make any detailed statement with respect to farm income. It is a striking fact, however, that farm income has shown a drastic reduction since 1947, in comparison with other incomes. The per capita income of the farmers of America has gone down from year to year, in 1947, 1948, 1949, and 1950, whereas the income of every other segment of America's population shows a substantial increase since 1947.

It is apparent that if crop conditions remain good, and prices do not continue to decline, which is the marked course of prices of stable and basic agricultural commodities, in the year 1951 agricultural income will slightly recoup some of the losses, and eliminate in part the very great disparity which exists between the income of the farm population and that of other segments of our population.

In the course of the hearings, the Department of Agriculture made reference to some charts which were prepared for submission to the defense agencies to assist the Department in securing the necessary priorities for steel for farm machinery, copper wire for rural electrification, fertilizers, and so forth, which were necessary to achieve the increased goals that have been fixed for agricultural production. I was so impressed with the charts that I requested the Department of Agriculture to bring them down to date, in order that I could let all the Members of the Senate have the advantage of the information. I believe they show a rather graphic picture of the great achievements of American agriculture in increasing production during the past 10 years.

Mr. President, we must always bear in mind that our farm population has been decreasing during the same period of time. Fifty years ago each farmer in the United States was required to produce food and clothing for himself and for seven other American citizens. Today, because of the shift of our population to urban areas, the average farmer must produce food and fiber for 15 American citizens. The ability of the farmers to do this constitutes a great achievement; without which it would have been impossible for us to have waged World War II to a victorious conclusion. It would likewise have been impossible for us to bring about the great increase in the standard of diet of the American people, which is reflected by the charts.

The chart which I now exhibit shows the 1951 goal for agriculture under the all-out production drive. The index relates to the production in the period from 1935 to 1939, inclusive, because they were the 4 years which passed immediately before the outbreak of World War II. Of course, we were not drawn into the war until a year later.

In 1940 agricultural production was 110 percent of the base-period production. I ask Senators to notice the greatly increasing scale of production during the war years to 1946, the year after the war, when it reached 137 percent of the production during the base period.

Mr. President, this chart is, I think, a monument to the labor sacrifices, and efforts of the American farmers. They were compelled to contend with shortages of machinery, with shortages of fertilizer, and with serious shortages of farm labor; but they overcame all those difficulties and brought the production up to 137 percent of the quantities produced during the base period.

The goal for 1951 is 144 percent of the base-period production. That is based on the need for food for our Armed Forces. I have here another chart which shows how much more it takes to feed a soldier than it does to feed a civilian. That chart takes into account our greatly increasing population.

Our population has increased by 20,000,000 since the time prior to World War II, and is now increasing at the rate of 6,000 new American citizens each and every day. The birth rate, as compared with the death rate, gives us a net increase of population in the United States of 6,000 persons a day.

We also, of course, wish to have sufficient food to take care of our overseas commitments to our allies who stand with us in the cause of freedom, and we also have the purpose of replacing the depleted reserves of agricultural production.

There is one chart here which demonstrates that instead of having a great surplus and carry-over of agricultural commodities, we have a steadily decreasing reserve.

Mr. President, the next chart merely shows the reasons why it is necessary to encourage all-out production of farm commodities, in order to meet the continuous and expanding need. Let us remember that even partial military mobilization calls for a great increase in food needs.

A moment ago when I pointed out that our population has increased by 20,000,000, I might have pointed out that that increase is 15 percent.

Mr. President, it is remarkable to contemplate that our civilian-food consumption per capita is 13 percent above the 1935–39 average. In other words, because of the greatly increased national income, the people of the United States are now consuming 13 percent more food, on a per capita basis, than they consumed in the period from 1935 to 1939, inclusive.

The next page of this presentation shows some reasons why military mobilization so drastically increased the need for the production of food and fiber. In the first place military kitchens must be backed up with from 7 to 9 months' supplies of reserve stores or supplies of food, whereas the civilian community requires only from 7 to 9 days of reserves of food. In the second place, men in uniform eat far more than civilians eat. For example, a man in uniform eats more than twice as much meat as the average civilian eats. I feel sure that no one would begrudge the very best food in the largest quantities it is possible to obtain for those who are wearing their country's uniform in a time of great national peril. At the present time, for 3,500,000 men, which constitute only 2 and one-third percent of our population, the military requires that there be set aside, on the average, more than 9 percent of the national pack of canned fruits and vegetables.

Of course, Mr. President, it is quite obvious that if it should become necessary to increase the number of men in the Armed Forces, much more food will

be required, or else we shall have to take the food from our dwindling reserves.

The next chart shows the increase in civilian food consumption. The chart is entitled "Civilian Food Demand." From a base of 108, as compared with the average for the period 1935–39, the consumption of food has increased to the point where it is anticipated that in 1952 the figure will be 137 percent. Of course, with the increase in the income of the civilian population, food consumption will continue to increase, and the line on the chart indicating the consumption of food will continue to ascend.

The next chart relates to exports of agricultural commodities. Perhaps I knew it, but I was surprised to see how much our agricultural-commodity exports have increased since the war, as compared with the exports during the war years. Such exports reached their peak in about 1948, and have been gradually decreasing since that time. However, because of the shipment of wheat to India and the need for considerable foodstuffs to prevent starvation among the civilian population of Korea, a slight increase is anticipated in 1951.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask whether the exports of agricultural products are being shipped on a basis which is profitable to the farmers of our country; or are those exports being made with government aid?

Mr. RUSSELL. The greater proportion of them are going with Government aid. Does the Senator mean to ask whether ECA and other funds are being used to defray a part of the costs?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; I meant to inquire whether agricultural commodities are going abroad on a basis which means that they are profitable exports for the farmers of our country, or whether the exports are being made with Government aid—in other words, with the use of the taxpayers' funds.

Mr. RUSSELL. Some of the exports, other than ECA shipments, involve a loss to the taxpayers. For example, approximately 2 or 3 years ago the Senate ratified an international wheat agreement, a treaty with other wheat-producing nations, providing for the disposal of the wheat crops of the earth. Under American prices, we have committed ourselves to a permanent annual outgo of approximately $76,000,000 worth of wheat a year to carry out the terms of that agreement; and of coruse that is a cost on the American taxpayers, over and above the expenditures which are necessary to be made in order to carry out the ECA program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yesterday I read in the newspapers, or perhaps it was in Time magazine, that in May we shipped 25,000,000 pounds of dried eggs to England, and that a short time ago we shipped 16,800,000 pounds of dried eggs to England. I assume that those eggs were purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation, because egg prices have decreased, and those eggs are now being sold at a loss to the Government. Is not that true?

Mr. RUSSELL. That has been true in the past, but my impression from the testimony which was submitted to the subcommittee, is that about the only commodity which the Commodity Credit Corporation still has in supply consists of dried eggs. The Commodity Credit Corporation has disposed of practically all of its other surpluses.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So that, when the chart says "Agricultural exports help friendly nations," it means of course, that they help them because they feed them, but it results in costs to our Government by reason of certain losses, and it results in certain profits to our farmers.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think there is any question that the greater part of this activity is handled with tax money, if that is what the Senator has in mind; and that has been true ever since World War II. Most of the overseas shipments of foods rave been those which were shipped under ECA, or under our wheat program, to India, or our shipments to Korea, to feed the civilian population there.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BENTON. What is the meaning of the volume index "50"?

Mr. RUSSELL. The volume index was the average for the four prewar years, 1935–39, inclusive.

Mr. BENTON. Does it represent dollars, or tonnage? What are the units? It is 50 units of what? I see that we trebled our exports.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is on a volume basis.

Mr. BENTON. It could be deceptive, if it related to dollars, and that was the reason for my question. With rising prices, it is conceivable that if prices had trebled, we could be exporting the same amount of food, but the curve would rise three times as fast.

The Senator figures that the tonnage chart would not show so great an increase, does he not?

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say to the Senator that there has been a very drastic reduction in the price of basic agricultural commodities within the past 3 months. Cotton has declined from around 44 cents a pound to 33 cents. I do not see the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] on the floor at the moment, but I call attention to the fact that wheat has suffered a reduction of approximately 20 or 30 cents a bushel.

Mr. BENTON. Perhaps that is the explanation of the decline shown at the end of the chart.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; because at one place we refer to 1950. This chart shows the 1951 anticipation. The other chart shows the decline which took place in 1950. As a matter of fact, the downward trend which is evidenced is one of the arguments which have been used to show the efficiency of the ECA program, to indicate that it has helped put other countries, such as France, into such shape that they could produce more of their own requirements.

Mr. BENTON. I desire to congratulate the Senator upon these exceedingly graphic charts, which are the most illuminating I have ever seen on this subject.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. They were so interesting to me that, even though they were prepared for presentation to defense agencies in order to secure additional steel and copper wire for the farmers, I asked that I might have them so as to make them available to the Senate.

We have heard a great deal about the food surplus in this country. There have been times when the Commodity Credit Corporation was roundly condemned and when the entire farm-loan program was condemned because the Department was acquiring surpluses of food. The surpluses which were on hand at the outbreak of World War II not only saved this Nation, or at least enabled us to bring the war to a close 3 or 4 years earlier than would have been possible otherwise, but they netted a considerable profit to the Department of Agriculture, or the Commodity Credit Corporation, because of the increased prices of the staple commodities accumulated.

The next chart relates to the total food stocks of this country, and it covers the time from pre-Korea to the 1st day of July 1951, a period of 1 year. The surplus of butter has declined from 185,000,000 pounds to 42,000,000 pounds, which is a very small surplus of butter to have for the population of the United States. The dried-milk surplus has declined from 469,000,000 to 130,000,000 pounds; cheese, from 254,000,000 to 195,000,000 pounds; canned vegetables, for stocks on hand, from 75,000,000 cases to 64,000,000 cases. Canned fruits have declined from 21,000,000 cases to 16,500,000 cases. The over-all picture shows that our supplies amount to but one-half what they were on June 25, 1950. They are not surpluses. Any ordinarily prudent nation would carry over a small amount of food in reserve.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have seen in the press certain statements which have led me to ask the military department for a report. I have in my office a letter, for instance, regarding butter. I am sorry I do not have the letter with me. Has the Senator investigated to determine whether the Commodity Credit Corporation's stock which is to be sold to the Army, to the military forces, and so on, is accumulated in such a way that the military can buy it? For instance, I read that the Army was buying butter at a substantially higher price than the price at which the Commodity Credit Corporation was selling it. Upon inquiry I found that the Commodity Credit Corporation had the butter in tubs, whereas the Army could not buy it in tubs. Has the Senator inquired into that situation at all?

Mr. RUSSELL. Insofar as butter is concerned, the testimony before the committee was that the CCC had no butter at all, but had disposed of all of its stocks.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The circumstance to which I refer occurred a little while ago, but the CCC disposed of the butter at substantially lower prices than the prices at which the Army was buying from other sources.

Mr. RUSSELL. That may be. Of course, we feed our troops the very best available food that can possibly be purchased. Some people prefer fresh butter to tub butter which has been in storage for some time. The mess officers of the Army, when fresh butter is available, purchase it rather than tub butter which is in storage.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall be glad to show the Senator the letter to which I referred. I regret that I do not have it with me at the moment. As I understand, it was not a question of the quality of the butter, but rather a question of the method by which the butter was stored.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is wholly possible. There arises the question of the specifications in the purchase of the commodity. I am advised by the Senator from Texas, whose subcommittee has inquired into that subject very thoroughly, that there was a question of standards and specifications, and that the Department of Agriculture and the Military Establishment are now undertaking to reconcile the standards and the specifications followed by the military with those applied to the commodities which are handled by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL subsequently said: Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to recur to the question I asked the Senator from Georgia in relation to tubs of butter. Does the Senator recall that colloquy?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I recall it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It would be well if the present colloquy could be transferred to the point at which the previous discussion about tubs of butter took place. I refer the Senator to a letter which I received dated June 19, 1951. It was written to me by Karl R. Bendetsen, Assistant Secretary of the Army. His letter to me was in response to several questions I asked him in a letter I addressed to him. With the Senator's permission, I should like, at the conclusion of what I am going to ask him, to place the letter in the RECORD, as the basis of my question, if the Senator will permit me to do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection whatever.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I asked Mr. Bendetsen about powdered eggs. Mr. Bendetsen said:

> You will note that the study indicates that powdered eggs in the CCC stocks do not meet the specification required by the Army, both as to quality and type of packaging.

I called his attention to the three words "type of packaging."

My other question related to butter. Mr. Bendetsen stated in his letter in respect to that question:

> Here again, the butter stocks held by CCC are not processed in the manner which would be acceptable to the Army. Our understanding is that their stocks are in large bulk tubs. This is not susceptible to the Army's method of distribution.

That is what I specifically called to the Senator's attention.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; and as I recall, I replied to the Senator from Massachusetts that that condition undoubtedly existed, and that the representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Defense were now engaged in conferences in an effort to come to some agreement on the specifications of the Military Department as compared with the method of handling by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, with the Senator's permission, I ask unanimous consent to have included, as the basis of my questions on this subject, a letter written to my by Karl R. Bendetsen, Assistant Secretary of the Army, dated June 19, 1951.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., June 19, 1951.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: In response to your request of the other day wherein you were interested in the matter of procurements made by the Army relating to foodstuffs and the possibility of utilizing Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, I have investigated this matter for you and am attaching a paper on this matter for your information.

You specifically asked about powdered eggs. You will note that the study indicates that the powdered eggs in the CCC stocks do not meet the specifications required by the Army, both as to quality and type of packaging. Your other question related to butter and, as I recall, you mentioned a price of 16 cents a pound. We have failed to identify any price approximating that figure inasmuch as we are advised that CCC butter is selling for approximately 60 cents a pound. Here again, the butter stocks held by CCC are not processed in the manner which would be acceptable to the Army. Our understanding is that their stocks are in large bulk tubs. This is not susceptible to the Army's method of distribution.

I wish to assure you that the Army will continue to deal with the CCC by maintaining direct liaison with them and, wherever possible, purchases will be made from their stocks when available in accordance with the limitations of their policies and when the goods are acceptable in accordance with Army specifications.

I believe the material submitted herewith will clarify the situation which has concerned you.

Sincerely yours,
KARL R. BENDETSEN,
Assistant Secretary of the Army.

Mr. RUSSELL. The next chart, Mr. President, relates to the carry-over of the three great basic commodities, cotton, corn, and wheat. The carry-over of cotton in 1951, despite all the condemnation of the loan program, was about 2,000,000 bales, which is about a 2 months' supply for the cotton mills of the United States. In other words, if there were a crop failure in cotton, there would be a tremendous shortage in the supply of cotton for the looms of the American textile industry and for the backs of the American people. Even if there were to be a 16,000,000-bale crop this year, as anticipated, which was the target, there would be only a 2,000,000-bale carry-over in 1952, because the foreign countries demand 5,800,000 bales of export cotton.

The chart also shows the corn carry-over. It shows that we will have, in 1952, an estimated carry-over of 447,000,000 bushels of corn. I should like to point out that the carry-over in 1949 was 825,000,000 bushels; in 1950 it was 860,000,000 bushels; in 1951 it comes down to 665,000,000 bushels; and in 1952 it is estimated that the carry-over of corn will be only 447,000,000 bushels. It has been only a comparatively short while since we had a great controversy as to whether the Commodity Credit Corporation should assist in increasing the corn carry-over by making loans to farmers for receptacles in which to store corn; but we now have more storage space than we have corn to place in it. The desirable carry-over is between 800,000,000 and 1,000,000,000 bushels. The carry-over is only 20 percent of our annual requirement of corn to fatten the beef, the pork, and the mutton which the American people consider the most important part of their diet, when they have the money to pay for it, as they have today. A substantial crop failure, such as this country has seen in the past, might place us in a situation with respect to grain where we could not possibly fatten livestock on the farms of this country.

We do not often consider, Mr. President, how good providence has been to us since 1940. We have not suffered a single crop failure since 1940 throughout any substantially wide area of the Nation. If a crop failure, such as this country has seen in the past, should occur, we would be in a terrible predicament to secure sufficient quantities of cotton, wheat, and corn.

The next chart shows the wheat carry-over. It shows how it has gone down to an anticipated 324,000,000 bushels. That is only 29 percent of our annual requirements. It is conservatively estimated that we should have a carry-over of at least 500,000,000 bushels of wheat so as to assure the American people of bread in the event of a partial crop failure.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BENTON. These two charts are very ominous, from the standpoint of the beef interests, in connection with the capacity to increase production in order to hold down prices of meat. How can we greatly expand production as an antidote to higher prices if there are shortages of corn and wheat?

Mr. RUSSELL. It fixes a very definite limit on the amount to which beef and other meat production can be ex-

panded. If we wish to gamble on the future, there is a considerable quantity of corn which is available for feed. We have developed great pastures, and a considerable percentage of the beef reaching the market now is pasture fed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am happy to yield to one of the most valuable members of my subcommittee.

Mr. THYE. I should like to comment concerning the wheat carry-over. All the factors were taken into consideration when Congress approved the shipment of wheat to India. We took into consideration the oncoming crop, and we also recognized we might possibly draw on our reserve of wheat to a minimum, but, nevertheless, with a fair crop this year, and, in some areas, a crop that is excellent, we believed we would have a sufficient supply of wheat coming on to assure ourselves of an ample supply. But if we had not made the commitment of wheat to India, we would have had a much larger reserve than we now have. Howeve, all that was taken into consideation at the time of the action of the Congress.

M. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his contribution. What he has just said is correct. The commitment of wheat to India appealed to the charitable and humanitarian instincts of the American people, and I believe we would have taken a little greater chance in order to ship food to the hungry people of that nation.

The next chart merely shows that we are using supplies at a greater rate than we produced them in 1950. Of course, it should be said, in all fairness, that the 1951 crop will be considerably larger than was the 1950 crop. In 1950 there were in effect acreage allotments and marketing quotas with respect to a number of commodities. All those have been removed, and we have encouraged the farmers to increase their acreage, so there will be a considerably larger production. It still appears that the 1952 demands will exceed the 1951 production, and we need every ounce of production we can squeeze out. That, as I stated before, was the reason for the appeal of the Department of Agriculture to the defense agencies for assistance in procuring steel for the production of our war machine.

The next chart shows, Mr. President, that all-out production will help fight inflation. Consumer spending continues at a high level, and defense expenditures are still increasing. High-level production is the greatest contribution our food plant can make to price stability. Without regard to the position of any Member of the Senate, I believe that all will agree that increasing production is, in the last analysis, the most effective weapon that can be used against inflation.

Mr. President, the next chart is, to me, a tremendously interesting one, because it shows that despite the increase in the cost of the food basket of the American people, the average value of an hour of employment of factory labor has increased at such a rate that as great or greater amounts of all foods, except round steak, can be purchased with 1 hour of factory labor than was the case in 1939. In other words, while there have been increases in the cost of foods, the increases in wage rates have been sufficient to keep pace with it and, in most instances, to outstep it.

With reference to bread, 1 hour of factory labor in 1939 would buy 7.9 loaves of bread. In 1949 and 1951, 1 hour of factory labor would buy 10 loaves of bread.

With respect to steak, 1 hour of factory labor in 1939 would buy 1.8 pounds of round steak. In 1949, it would buy 1.6 pounds, and in 1951 it will buy 1.5 pounds.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator have any figures showing what 1 hour of labor in this country would buy in a comparison with other countries?

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not ask for those particular charts, but I have seen them, and I might state that they present a dramatic picture, showing the blessings of American citizenship in as spectacular a way as any song or sonnet that man might write. I can get the charts for the Senator, if he so desires.

With respect to bacon, in 1939 1 hour of factory labor would buy 2 pounds of bacon. In 1951 1 hour of factory labor will buy 2.3 pounds of bacon.

With reference to butter, it is unusual, but butter has remained absolutely stationary. One hour of factory labor would buy 1.9 pounds of butter in 1939, in 1949, and in 1951.

When we come to milk, however, we find that 1 hour of factory labor will buy more milk today than it would in either of the other periods. In 1939, one hour of labor would buy 5.1 quarts of milk. In 1949 it would buy 6.7 quarts of milk, and in February, 1951, it would buy 6.9 quarts of milk.

Likewise, in the case of eggs, there has been an increase in the purchasing power of an hour of labor as compared with its previous purchasing power. In 1939, one hour of labor would buy 1.9 dozen eggs. In 1951, one hour of labor will buy 2½ dozen eggs.

The other commodity shown on this chart is potatoes. In 1939 one hour of labor would buy 25.3 pounds of potatoes but in February of 1951, one hour of labor would buy 36.3 pounds, an increase of 11 pounds of potatoes when exchanged in terms of one hour of factory labor.

Mr. President, the statement has been made that, factory wages as such have increased in greater ratio than have other wages, and I think that statement is correct. But the chart I now exhibit shows the percentage of the per capita food costs of the people in whatever occupation engaged, as compared with the base period of 1935-39. Bear in mind that this chart reflects the per capita food costs as compared with the percentage of disposable income, which means that the taxes have been deducted from the gross income, and therefore the higher taxes which have been imposed upon the people of the United States are not reflected in this chart, because such taxes have been deducted in arriving at the purchasing power of disposable income.

In the 1935-39 base period 23 percent of the average disposable income went into foods. The same amount of food of the same kind can be purchased today for 19 percent of the disposable income. Of course, when the American people have sufficient income they eat much better. That is a source of gratification to all of us. So it requires 26 percent of the disposable income for the market basket of today, which contains a great many items that would have been considered luxury items in the 1935-39 period.

That same percentage exists for the second quarter of 1951. There has been practically no change in the relative position of the percentage of the disposable income of the American citizen required of him to feed his family.

I present another chart. This chart does not directly reflect upon the points that will be at issue in the consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill, but it is rather interesting. It shows that the farm output has risen by 28 percent since 1940. It shows that that has taken place on a cropland acreage that has increased only 3 percent. We must bear in mind, Mr. President, that only a limited amount of soil in this country is tillable and productive. Without the great strides forward we have made in research and in improved breeding of plants and animals and in research in combating diseases, we would have already fallen upon very scarce days because there has been no increase in our tillable acreage. The increase in production which has caused the American people to eat more than ever before and has enabled us to meet a constantly increasing population and supply their needs, has all taken place on the same acreage.

It is interesting to observe, as is shown on the chart, the decline in the use of horses and mules in American agriculture. Since 1940 there has been a reduction from 14,000,000 horses and mules on the American farms, down to 7,000,000. Of course, that is one of the reasons why we have been able to get more meat production, because it takes as much corn or other cereal to feed a work horse or a work mule as it does to fatten a steer. So by the mechanization of American farms we have been able with the same number of bushels of corn and wheat produced, to feed about 7,000,000 more head of livestock for the meat market than we could have under the old system of farming.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think the Senator from Georgia has just answered one of my questions. There are certain matters that do not appear on the chart the Senator has just exhibited. Perhaps reference is going to be made to them. The chart does not show the increase in the use of farm machinery, whereas it does show the decrease of horses and mules. Nor does the chart show under the cropland acreage the

increase in number of beef cattle and hogs that are slaughtered.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I do not have figures for those items. Such figures do not appear anywhere on these charts. But, of course, there has been a very substantial increase in the farm population of beef and hogs during the past 10 years.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So that the term "cropland acreage" would include not only the raising of corn, wheat, potatoes and vegetables, but also pasturage?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; the chart does not include pasturage. It merely includes the tilled acreage, the cultivated farm acreage.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So the chart contains no statistics respecting the number of beef cattle and hogs.

Mr. RUSSELL. No. I do not have those figures immediately at hand. They can be secured.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, before the Senator goes on to another chart, will he yield at that point?

Mr. RUSSELL. I gladly yield. The Senator from New Mexico should be standing here in my place to answer that question.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] asked the Senator from Georgia some questions as to the number of hours of work it took to acquire certain food commodities in foreign countries as compared to the United States. Those figures are not contained in the chart. I wonder if the Senator would not ask permission to insert that material later in connection with his presentation. It is available. I have seen it. I agree with what the Senator from Georgia stated and what the Senator from Arizona stated in that respect. It is a very remarkable story. Whereas it requires 22 hours of work to purchase certain food items in certain countries, it requires less than 1 hour of work in this country to acquire the same food items.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not recall the figures directly, but it seems to me that an industrial worker in Russia is compelled to work about 30 times as long in order to buy a loaf of bread as the American worker is compelled to work to buy the same bread.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish the Senator from Georgia would be good enough to place in the RECORD in connection with his presentation a table, which would be extremely useful, showing how many hours of labor are required to purchase various food items in various foreign countries. It would be extremely useful and a fine thing to have in the RECORD in connection with the presentation the Senator is making.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall endeavor to obtain such information. I do not know whether we can have such a chart printed in the RECORD. But I wish to say, that if any man has any doubts about the glories of living beneath the Stars and Stripes, if he will look at the comparative figures of what an hour of work in this country will buy as compared with what an hour of work will buy in any other nation in the world it will immediately extinguish his doubts.

The next table is not directly pertinent to this discussion. It was used to demonstrate the need for priorities on the various commodities. However, it deals with the question raised by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] as to the increase in the use of power and machinery on the farm. It shows that it has increased by 135 percent since 1940. Of course, that is one of the answers to the question as to how it was possible for the American farmers so greatly to increase their production when they had less labor and no more acres of tillable land.

The next chart contains one significant statement which is not often enough borne in mind by some of those who demand quick and drastic changes in the farm program. It shows that the "lead time" for agriculture is a full crop year or more. Food production cannot be turned on and off at will. We cannot produce an increased crop or cut it down, like turning a spigot on and off. It requires considerable planning and considerable work to get ready to increase or plant a crop. When it is once planted there is an investment, and it must be harvested, even if the farmer is compelled to do so at a loss, because whatever he produces reduces the loss.

Mr. President, I was greatly interested in these charts. I thought other Members of the Senate might also be interested. They showed the great accomplishments of American agriculture over the past 10 years in responding to the demands for ever-increased production. They show the very vital need for a real farm program today if agriculture is to reach its requirements and be enabled to furnish the food and fiber which are essential to any defense program. Of course, they are also fundamentally necessary for the existence of the American people, even if there were no defense program. Napoleon well said that an army travels on its belly. We can acquire all the planes, all the tanks, all the mechanized equipment, electronic equipment, and everything else embraced in the $60,000,000,000 military appropriation bill, but unless we give adequate consideration to the needs of a farm program for the American farmer the defense program will avail us nothing, because the one fundamental requirement for an army is food and clothing.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Is it not true that the bill was reported with practical unanimity? I believe there was entire agreement. Perhaps one Senator reserved certain rights, but otherwise it was reported with practical unanimity by the full committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think two members of the committee expressed some misgivings about certain items in the bill.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I do not think they expressed them with sufficient force to represent a substantial difference among the committee in disposing of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope that, upon reflection, they will not express them at all, but will support the committee in its effort to give the country the farm program which is necessary.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to that fighting friend of agriculture, the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder if the Senator from Georgia would give us his opinion as to what is the reason for the continuous attempt at harassment of the farmers of the United States today. What is behind the apparently well-organized campaign to blame them for everything that goes wrong? Why are they under continuous attack by the metropolitan press and others, when the country depends upon them more than upon any other single segment of our economy? This morning I received a letter from a woman who was actually petulant because most of the farmers in the community owned automobiles, as though there were something wrong about that. Just what is the reason for it, and what is hoped to be accomplished by the continual campaign against the farmers of America? We know that there are some farmers—I call them Waldorf farmers—who earn their money at something else, and then spend it rather recklessly on the farm. Why are they held up before the public as typical wealthy and greedy farmers? What is behind the apparently well-organized campaign to discredit the farmers of the United States?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to say a word?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I will say to the Senator from Vermont that I am absolutely sure that no such view is taken by a single member of the Agricultural Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont has no doubt about that.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I do not think there is a single Member who has that attitude, or anything approaching it. I do not believe that such a campaign as the Senator suggests has a particle of influence in determining these questions. We hrave tried in every way to make the farmer copartner with the Government in bringing about greater production, and bringing about a beter condition of life for the farmers, upon whom we all depend.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree with everything the Senator from Tennessee has said. I was not referring in any way to any committee of the Congress, because I think the Congress, and especially the Senator from Tennessee, understands and appreciates the problems of the farmers. I was referring to the campaign from outside.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have my own theory as to what inspires the efforts to which the Senator from Vermont alludes.

In the first place, there was a long period of time when there was a tremendous disparity between living conditions on the farm and in the cities or smaller communities, and there was a great migration from the farms to the cities. It became rather commonplace to look down upon those who lived on the farm. A person would expect his next-door neighbor to own an automobile, but if he saw a farmer with an automobile, there was something wrong about it. The man in town expected to send his son to college, but if he heard that a man living in the country, through superhuman effort and sacrifice, was able to send his son to college, he rather looked down his nose at him. He did not think it was necessary for the farm boy to go to college.

That has a great deal to do with the attitude to which the Senator refers. I do not like the expression "second-class citizen." I think it is badly abused by a considerable segment of the press. However, it defines the difference between the outlook of various persons with respect to what a farmer should require or what he should be entitled to, and what his more fortunate brethren in the city should have.

Further, I think a great deal of it is attributable to downright ignorance. I believe that a good many people do not understand the disparity between farm income and the income of those who do not live on the farm. I do not believe that they understand the hours of labor which are necessary for a farmer to produce the food which keeps the critic alive and the fiber with which he is clothed. Many persons are not aware of the facts. We have got far away from the roots of the country. In the past farming was the principal vocation of our people and most of the people lived on the farm. If people in the cities today are told that the farmer thinks nothing, in the gathering season, of working 14 hours a day for 6 days a week, they do not believe it. They ask, "What does he get for overtime?" He saves his crop. That is all he gets for overtime. In such a period he may work 14 hours a day. I believe a great deal of the criticism to which the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has referred is based upon plain, downright ignorance. Such people have no conception of what farm life in this country means.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. A moment ago the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] asked some questions with reference to the livestock population. I ask the Senator from Georgia to permit me to say that on January 1, 1940, the livestock population was about 68,300,000, of which approximately $36,400,000 were dairy cattle. Today the livestock population is about 84,000,000, of which about 37,500,000 are dairy cattle, and approximately 46,500,000 are normally used for the production of beef. Of course, a great many dairy cattle go into the production of beef. However, the increase in the beef population has been from slightly under 32,000,000 or 31,900,000 to about 46,500,000 in the 11 years.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for giving the detailed figures. When I was asked about the livestock population of the country, I had the figure of eighty-and-some-odd million in my mind, but I could not break it down as between dairy herds and beef cattle. I did know an increase had taken place in the beef industry. Some things happen slowly, but are, nevertheless, very spectacular to me. For example, the increase in the amount of milk that we have been able to get from the average cow in the past 15 years is the direct result of the research conducted in the Department of Agriculture and the labor on the part of the dairy herd owners.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. With the same amount of acreage we are raising more corn, which is used to raise more beef, which in turn is making us stronger. With the same amount of acreage we are raising more corn, more milk, and more dairy cows.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. It is the kind of protective type of food which is needed by the human being.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] for the clarity with which he has presented the subject of the production brought about by the farmers of the United States. I believe the farmers should be congratulated for the record of production they have made, especially during the war. The distinguished Senator from Georgia has already indicated that it was due largely to the educational programs of the Department of Agriculture. I wish to ask the Senator if he does not agree that it was also due to some programs which were inaugurated, some of which the Senator has sponsored, such as the soil-conservation program; and if he does not believe also that if some of the cuts which have been proposed are made in the bill they may also involve cuts in the national defense of our country?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question in my mind that the soil-conservation program is essential to the survival of American civilization. We have only so many million acres of tillable land. I believe it is about 460,000,000 acres. Our population is increasing at a tremendous rate. As I stated earlier today, it is increasing at the rate of more than 6,000 a day, as a net gain. Unless we can save the soil of this country, which is a priceless asset to every citizen—even to the citizen who would not know which end of the cow to try to milk—I do not see how we can hope to be a self-sustaining people.

We can go back into the history of the great civilizations of the past, and in many cases we find that their decline was due to the fact that they neglected to preserve the fertility of the soil, and therefore they could no longer sustain themselves. They were thus compelled to import foods from other lands and became dependent upon other people. The head of the Soil Conservation Bureau told our committee a few years ago that it was his belief that some parts of the Sahara Desert in north Africa was at one time a fertile land, supporting large cities and a great number of people. Today it does not produce anything, except sandstorms.

Unless we conserve our forests and our soil fertility as national assets, in which all of our people have a decided interest, we shall fail in our duty to those who will come after us. It is not fair to succeeding generations to mine and deplete the fertility of the soil of this country and thereby cause them to wage a hopeless struggle for existence on eroded, worn out, and depleted land.

The English economist, T. R. Malthus, the author of the Malthusian theory, with which I am sure many Senators are familiar, maintained that the time would come when the increase in population would be so great that the trend in population would start downward, because there would not be sufficient land on which to grow the amount of food necessary to feed the people. In other words, nature would adjust the population of the country to the resources of the land. I want to avoid that evil day in this country for as long as it can possibly be avoided. I believe the soil conservation program is one of the most effective weapons with which we can fight in our effort to assure us that our country will not be victimized by the application of the malthusian theory.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it not true that during the past 20 or 25 years, because of such measures as the Senator has spoken of, there has been more done in the way of improvement of the farmers' condition and of farming conditions generally than had ever been done in our entire history?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not believe there can be any question about it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it not also true that during the 25 years because of our fair dealing with the farmers, our country has been prosperous and has made more progress than it had ever made in its entire history?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is impossible to have prosperity in this country unless we also have a reasonable amount of prosperity on the farms.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to suggest that it is highly important to remember that in acting upon the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill we do not base our actions on our dislikes of certain political activities which some persons connected with official agriculture have exercised, and thus forget the great development to which the senior Senator from Tennessee has just referred, which has made the United States the greatest and most productive nation the world has ever known. In other words, political prejudices should not guide our

actions. Perhaps the term "political prejudices" is too strong a term. However, let us not go overboard and do something for which we will be sorry later.

Mr. RUSSELL. In other words, we should always keep national welfare and national interest paramount in our minds, without regard to our views as individuals.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say that I agree with every word the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has said. I wish to say further that he has done very much to help in every way he possibly could to better the conditions of the farmer and to try to treat them justly, so far as the Government can do so.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. I believe there can be no doubt as to what my State of Vermont thinks of certain political activities of the Government. However, the Vermont Legislature unanimously approved a resolution asking Congress to appropriate the full amount for soil conservation and soil-improvement work at this session of Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. I congratulate the Legislature of Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. They did it in spite of certain political activities, and not because of them. They put the economic welfare of agriculture and the country above politics.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to compliment the Senator from Georgia upon his presentation of the agricultural appropriation bill. As a member of the committee, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the presentation the Senator has made, and it gives me a better background on which to decide the questions which arise in connection with the bill.

Following what the Senator from Vermont has said in regard to New England farmers, I should like to say that no finer group of citizens is to be found. I should like to have the Senator from Georgia accompanying me to our eastern States Fair some autumn, and there show him the fine type of men and women who attend that fair.

Let me say to the Senator from Georgia that although Massachusetts is an industrial State, agricultural commodities still constitute the second largest single production in Massachusetts.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, all the farm groups of North Dakota do not always agree, but all of them are agreed in regard to this bill. They have telegraphed to me their approval, and they want these appropriations made, particularly those with respect to the school-lunch program.

I wish to join the Senator from Vermont in what he said a moment ago in tribute to the Senator from Georgia, who has done a very, very fine job.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I join in that statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senators. I know I can always depend upon both these Senators when the welfare of the American farmer is concerned.

TIDELANDS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to take some of the time of the Senate today to discuss a question which soon will come before the Senate; I refer to what is known as the tidelands case.

Propaganda methods long have been recognized as a vital part of the machinery of dictator governments.

No one in the Senate has observed more closely than I the workings of those propaganda machines that have helped to crush liberty and freedom abroad.

That is why I rise to protest the use of propaganda and double talk to mislead the people of the United States.

In a few days, I am informed, the House of Representatives will consider the so-called tidelands controversy; and, it appears that action also may be forthcoming soon in this Chamber.

CAMPAIGN OF CONFUSION

As the time for decision approaches, a campaign of confusion and untruths has been launched against the Congress.

Some very unfair statements are being made, and they reflect not only on the honor of patriotic American citizens, but also upon some Members of this Congress.

Seldom a day passes that someone does not write a letter or get someone to print an alleged article that says the oil barons and the so-called oil lobby are the ones behind the State ownership bill in the tidelands case.

There are in this country people who still believe that a contract should be kept; people who still believe that the theory of a Federal Union of several States should be preserved; people who believe that we should consider long, and with caution, further extension of powers of the Central Government.

I think those people should be allowed to have those beliefs without being smeared by being called tools of the oil barons.

OIL COMPANIES NOT INVOLVED

Let us get some truth into this business about the big oil companies.

Their first concern is producing and searching for oil. Under one plan that would take the submerged lands from State control, there is a promise to sustain the leases the oil companies made under State control. In other words, promises have been made to respect the leases of the oil companies, so that they will receive the benefit, regardless of what bill is enacted.

So it is plain to see that regardless of whether the States do the leasing or whether the Federal Government does the leasing, the oil companies will be protected.

The question in this case is not one of oil companies. The question is whether the Federal Government is going to become a common claim-jumper.

Today, the claims which the Federal Government would jump involve a resource called oil. Tomorrow, unless we stop this march toward nationalization, the resource may be something else—something in the submerged lands of Maine, or Illinois, or Florida, or any other State.

OIL INDUSTRY FOR FEDERAL LEASING

There is much talk about the oil lobby. The oil lobby has been around the Capitol recently, but what has it been lobbying for? Has it been going all out for the State ownership bill?

No; it has been plugging for an interim arrangement that would put leasing in the hands of the Federal Department of the Interior. That not only is the truth, but is the truth supported by the record.

Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from Wyoming is not now on the floor. He has a bill on this subject. I hope that he will enter the Chamber before I conclude my remarks, because I wish to make some comment about his bill.

The oil companies will make money under Federal ownership. And, if past experiences in Federal leases of uplands is any yardstick, the oil companies would get those leases a great deal cheaper under Federal control than under State control.

In spite of the truth and the record, the advocates of Federal seizure—and it is Federal seizure—of these submerged lands continue to smear as "oil barons" those who favor State ownership.

WHO FAVORS STATE BILL?

Let us see who the real supporters of State ownership are. They are some of the finest, most patriotic citizens in this country. Here are a few of the organizations which have endorsed State ownership of submerged lands:

The Council of State Governments.

The National Governors Conference.

The National Association of Attorneys General.

The National Conference of Mayors.

The American Association of Port Authorities.

The American Municipal Association, representing more than 10,000 municipalities in 42 States.

The American Bar Association. Is the American Bar Association an oil lobbyist?

The United States Chamber of Commerce.

The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce.

The National Reclamation Association. Is the National Reclamation Association an oil lobbyist?

The National Water Conservation Association.

The National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, representing more than a thousand cities.

The National Association of County Officials.

Mr. President, these are some of the organizations which are advocating State

to face up to realistically. It is not sufficient to decry conditions and unleash some impassioned oratory and point the finger and declare with patriotic fervor that we must "do something for our men in uniform."

The plain fact of the matter is that where these shocking housing conditions and rent gouging exists, the unscrupulous landlords who are extorting outrageous rents for dilapidated, filthy hovels are doing so, in most cases strictly within the limits of the law. I strongly doubt that the American people will permit the Congress to disclaim responsibility for these conditions and unless we act and act promptly and soundly to provide effective and enforceable legislation, we shall have failed not only the servicemen, but the whole Democratic ideal which is, in fact, the only reason for their being in uniform and subjected to these unwholesome and inexcusable indignities.

I am very happy that Secretary of the Army Frank Pace, Jr., is taking immediate steps to attack this whole problem.

I have prepared two bills which I believe meet the problem in a positive way. The first of these is an amendment and extension to the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 recontrolling all types of housing accommodations in critical defense housing areas, including motor courts, trailer courts, hotels, and new construction and conversions, setting up certain standards against gouging and profiteering and unfair eviction, and providing penalties for circumvention and evasion. The second measure would provide a means of expediting the construction of military or civilian housing projects vital to the national defense where private enterprise is unwilling or unable to undertake or finance such projects from an investment standpoint.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce the two bills, and to have printed in the RECORD a brief explanation of each of the two measures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Without objection, the bills will be received and appropriately referred, and the explanations will be printed in the RECORD.

The first bill (S. 1893) to amend and extend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, introduced by Mr. HENNINGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The explanation of the first bill presented by Mr. HENNINGS is as follows:

EXPLANATION BY SENATOR HENNINGS ON THE BILL TO AMEND THE HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947, AS AMENDED

The purpose of this bill is to recontrol all housing accommodations without exception in critical defense housing areas, to set maximum rents for such accommodations, to provide minimum standards for decent living accommodations, to provide authority against circumvention and evasion, and to provide for enforcement through adequate criminal and civil sanctions.

Section 1 abolishes the office of the Housing Expediter and transfers the functions of that office to the President.

Section 2 provides for the establishment of maximum rents for all housing accommodations in critical defense housing areas (which are defined in this bill in the same way they are defined in the Defense Production Act of 1950) at the highest rent charged during the period May 24, 1950, to June 24, 1950.

It also sets standards for individual or general rent adjustments on the basis of (1) increase or decrease in cost of operation; (2) comparability either above or below rents generally prevailing in the area during the period from May 24, 1950, to June 24, 1950; (3) adequacy of housing accommodations for normal decent family life; (4) overcrowding of housing accommodations. This section also provides maximum rents for all accommodations rented for the first time subsequent to this base period including, but not limited to, conversions and new construction. Under this section the landlord must petition for the establishment of a maximum rent. In order to afford adequate opportunity for consideration of such petition and consideration of all the standards enumerated above, a temporary maximum rent may be established for such housing accommodations for a period not to exceed 90 days.

Local advisory boards in critical defense housing areas are authorized to make recommendations to the President concerning improvement of housing conditions and alleviation of hardship resulting from housing shortage for military personnel and their dependents. Maximum rents in these areas shall not be subject to termination by local advisory boards or by State or local action.

Section 3 authorizes regulations, orders and requirements which the President may deem necessary to prevent circumvention and evasion, including such practices as requiring tenants to buy, lease, or rent services, equipment, furnishings, effects, facilities, or similar devices.

Section 4 sets liability for unlawful overcharge which is demanded, accepted, or retained at $50 or three times the amount of the overcharge, whichever is greater plus attorney's fees and costs. It also sets the liability for unlawful eviction at (1) 1 month's rent or $50, whichever is greater, or (2) not more than three times the monthly rent or $150 whichever is greater.

Section 5 provides for adequate criminal and civil sanctions including up to $5,000 fine and 1 year imprisonment for willful and flagrant violation of this act.

The second bill (S. 1894) to assist the national defense by authorizing the provision of housing at reactivated military installations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HENNINGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The explanation of the second bill by Mr. HENNINGS is as follows:

EXPLANATION BY SENATOR HENNINGS ON THE BILL TO ASSIST THE NATIONAL DEFENSE BY AUTHORIZING THE PROVISION OF HOUSING AT REACTIVATED MILITARY INSTALLATIONS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The purpose of this bill is to provide a means of expediting the construction of military or civilian housing projects vital to the national defense where private enterprise is hesitant or unwilling to undertake or finance such projects from an investment standpoint. The projects would be financed under insurance by the Federal Housing Administration pursuant to the Military Housing Act insofar as practicable.

The bill authorizes the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, directly and through the facilities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to organize building companies to construct, manage and liquidate such projects. The bill is modelled upon S. 4145 of the last Congress, which passed the Senate by unanimous vote on September 15, 1950. The only substantial modification is the increase in the limitation of total expenditures from $130,000,000 to $200,000,000.

The program provided by the bill is patterned after the program of Defense Homes Corporation in World War II. DHC was organized and operated first as a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and thereafter transferred to the Public Housing Administration. The Corporation constructed necessary defense housing projects at a cost of approximately $100,000,000, operated the projects on a businesslike basis, and when the emergency ended disposed of the projects without loss to the Government.

A section-by-section analysis of the bill follows:

Section 1 authorizes RFC, upon request by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, to purchase stock in building companies to be formed to develop rental housing projects, in aggregate amount not exceeding $50,000,000.

Section 2 directs RFC to transfer such stock to Administrator, against cancellation of equivalent obligations by Treasury.

Section 3 provides that officers and employees of building companies be employees of HHFA and serve without additional compensation.

Section 4 directs the Administrator to cause building companies to procure and develop housing necessary for national defense, including prefabricated or other portable or mobile housing; provides power of condemnation to Administrator for such purpose; authorizes Administrator to utilize facilities of RFC to assist building program.

Under the bill, the Administrator may form one company to construct some or all of the projects, or may form separate companies for separate projects. The formation of separate companies would be required where the financing is insured by FHA, and has certain advantages in any event, particularly with respect to facilitating disposition of the Government's equity.

Section 5 authorizes RFC to make loans to the building companies to finance construction of their projects in aggregate amounts not exceeding $150,000,000, with the proviso that to the greatest extent practicable, such loans must be insured by FHA.

Section 6 directs the Administrator to liquidate the projects, and the RFC to liquidate its loans, as expeditiously as may be practicable.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Agricultural Economics," on page 3, line 16, after the word "trends", to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$2,250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 10, after "(7 U. S. C. 951–957)", to strike out "$2,850,000" and insert "$2,848,304."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Agricultural Research Administration—Office of Administrator," on page 4, line 23, after the word "Center",

to strike out "$560,000" and insert "$541,440", and on page 5, line 24, after the word "greater", to insert "except for the alteration of one building at Greenfield, Mass., at a cost not to exceed $7,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Research on agricultural problems of Alaska," on page 6, line 16, after "Alaska", to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$261,550."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Experiment Stations," on page 7, line 23, after the word "Alaska", to strike out "$37,500" and insert "$52,500", and on page 8, line 2, after "Puerto Rico", to strike out "$12,416,208" and insert "$12,431,208."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses," on page 8, line 14, after "Puerto Rico", to strike out "$390,000" and insert "$367,090."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Animal Industry—Salaries and expenses," on page 9, line 22, after the numerals "1950", to strike out "$3,200,700" and insert "$3,320,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 9, after the word "products", to strike out "$7,750,000" and insert "$7,731,022."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 3, after the word "virus", to strike out "$49,300" and insert "$47,906."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Dairy Industry," an page 11, line 20, after the word "butter", to strike out "$1,450,000" and insert "$1,491,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry", on page 12, line 6, after the word "thereof", to strike out "$7,200,000" and insert "$7,300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Delaware withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator from Georgia desire to withhold consideration of the next amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. The only reason I rose was that I understood the item relating to the appropriation on page 12, line 22, was to go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment will go over.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask that the item go over, because I understand the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] desires to offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment on line 6, page 12, has been agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment on page 12, lines 22, 23, and 24, is to go over.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will go over.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings incident to the call of the roll be suspended, and that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the amendment on page 12, in line 22, was passed over; was it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 3, after "(20 U. S. C. 191–194)", to strike out "$148,600" and insert "$136,920."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine—Salaries and expenses," on page 14, line 15, after the word "application", to strike out "$3,525,000" and insert "$3,797,725."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 16, after the numerals "1948", to strike out "$4,500,000" and insert "$4,716,062."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Control of Forest Pests," on page 18, line 8, after "594–1—594–5)", to strike out "$1,700,000" and insert "$3,600,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Forest Service—Salaries and expenses," on page 22, line 5, after the word "forests", to strike out "$27,122,025" and insert "$27,522,025."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I cannot object to the amendment, but I should like to address an inquiry to the chairman of the subcommittee with reference to this item. Is this the item with reference to the Forest Service's management of timber sales?

Mr. RUSSELL. I understood that this is the item on page 22, line 5, relating to the general administration of the national forests.

Mr. CORDON. That is the item which includes the moneys for the handling of sales of forest timber, is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. The fact that the request made to the committee was for about $1,500,000 more than the amount allowed by the House, and the fact that the Senate committee allowed only an increase of $400,000, raises a question as to the adequacy of the amount proposed to be appropriated to handle the making of sales and the processing of sales of national forest timber in the several States. The figures, which were given to the committee, as I recall them, indicated that the cost of the making of sales of forest timber and of processing the sales after they were made was, on the average, about 25 percent of the receipts. Frankly, that seems to me to be a rather high percentage, and to indicate that a saving percentagewise could and should be made by the Forest Service in this item. It would seem that the cost is somewhat exorbitant on the basis of 25 percent of the receipts from such sales.

I have made some inquiry into the matter, and in the revested railroad lands in Oregon, the highest percentage cost of making and processing sales is 9 percent of receipts. The State of Oregon, which has a very considerable forested area, puts a ceiling of 10 percent on the making and processing of sales. A private industry in the pine region has found that the cost of both the making and the processing of sales never runs less than 4 percent, and never more than 10 percent. So if we may assume that the percentage of cost to income can be reduced somewhat, it may well be that with the $400,000 extra which the Committee on Appropriations has recommended there can be quite a considerable increase in the volume of sales and processing over that estimated by the Forest Service.

I assume that if the requests for purchases, and the necessities for processing, because of increased operations, keep on increasing, and assuming the $400,000 can be retained in conference, the Forest Service might reasonably ask for a supplemental budget item, sometime within the fiscal year, if it finds that the necessities go beyond what this amount could reach. I would ask the Senator for his thoughts about that matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Oregon is not only greatly interested in the work of the Forest Service, but he is a member of the subcommittee which handles this item, and in the past has been a member on the part of the Senate of the conference committee meeting with the House conferees on the agricultural appropriation bill. So, he is thoroughly familiar with the difficulties which we have encountered in attempting to obtain an increase in this item.

I completely agree with his statement that 25 percent is entirely too great an amount of overhead to be involved in these sales. I do not believe the present timber sales program contemplates anything like 25 percent, but there was some figure indicating that the Forest Service expected to increase their income by about four times the amount of this appropriation, or something approximating that amount; so it is perhaps not unfair to say that 25 percent of the increase was contemplated, as compared with the return to be expected. If, of course, the demand for timber for defense needs increases, and if the Forest Service could make a case that they could increase ma-

terially the revenue to the Federal Treasury from the sale of timber of the national forests by a reasonable amount of overhead, I should think they would be justified in requesting an additional appropriation. Even though I am opposed in principle to the incurring of deficiencies, where the Congress has denied appropriations, I make this statement because this item relates to obtaining revenue for the Federal Treasury, rather than to a completely out-of-pocket expense.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Georgia also agrees does he not, that there is the aspect of abnormal need of forest products, which may increase because of the emergency, and particularly in connection with the defense housing program, which is now getting under way?

Mr. RUSSELL. There can be no question about timber being in short supply, and apparently the demand is increasing faster than the need can be supplied.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UNDERWOOD in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 22, line 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 4, after the word "economics", to strike out "$5,220,500" and insert "$5,108,603."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

USE OF CLERK HIRE ALLOTMENTS FOR PAYMENT OF TELEGRAPH CHARGES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, out of order, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this is a bill to make funds which are allotted to Senators for clerical hire available for use in the payment of toll charges on telegrams. The bill is short, and I shall read it:

Be it enacted, etc., That any funds which are allotted to a Senator from sums appropriated for payment of the compensation of administrative and clerical assistants shall be available for payment of charges on official Government business paid and collect telegrams in excess of the number prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate pursuant to the provisions of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947 (60 Stat. 392; 2 U. S. C. 46e).

Mr. President, I may say that it always seems strange to me that the amount of money allotted to a Senator is earmarked so that, although he may not use all that is appropriated for his clerical hire, he cannot apply it to the payment of charges for telegrams. For example, the Senator from North Dakota, in 1 year, did not use between $9,000 and $10,000 allotted to him, and this year he has not used in the neighborhood of $5,000 or $6,000, yet I used up my telegram allowance quite early, and am now more than $200 overdrawn for telegrams which are all connected with official business, telegrams mostly in response to messages from citizens of the State of North Dakota who wanted to have prompt replies.

I might add that I have taken this question up with the Committee on Rules and Administration at different times, and the committee has held that it does not have the power to order a transfer of any money from the amount appropriated for clerical hire to the telegram fund. The committee suggested that I introduce this bill. I may say that I took it up with the leaders on both sides of the aisle.

The bill (S. 1895) to make funds allotted to Senators for clerk hire available for use for payment of toll charges on telegrams, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

NORTH DAKOTA WHEAT YIELD GREATEST IN STATE HISTORY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am happy to report that the crops in North Dakota at the present time look very, very good, and, barring any damage by the elements or ravaging insects, we expect to have bumper crops.

The July 19 issue of the Leader, published at Bismarck, N. Dak., under the headline "North Dakota Wheat Yield May Be Greatest in State History," states:

The biggest wheat crop in North Dakota's history will be harvested this year, the United States Department of Agriculture forecast last week. The Department's July 1 estimate put the prospective State wheat crop at 165,540,000 bushels. * * * If the crop comes through as abundantly as indicated by July 1 conditions, North Dakota will return to the No. 1 position among wheat-producing States.

When the President spoke to the Nation on December 16, 1951, relative to the international situation, he also stated that one of the two National Guard units to be ordered immediately into active duty was the Forty-seventh Division, comprised of men and boys from the Middlewestern States of North Dakota and Minnesota.

I should like, in this connection, to take this method of advising the military authorities of our Armed Forces—Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, and Coast Guard—of the immediate need for implementation of a harvest furlough program of at least a 30-day period in order that these men in the various services, who come from farms where the family cannot now obtain sufficient or competent help to run the power farm machinery, can return to their family farms to assist with the harvesting of the crops. I have here a number of letters which are typical of the many that I have received from desperate mothers and fathers who have written me concerning their need for the help of their sons during the harvest period, which is so eminent.

I should like particularly to call attention to two letters I have received—one from Mr. Russell D. Chase, State's Attorney of Stutsman County, Jamestown, N. Dak., and the other from Mrs. W. A. Lilyquist, of Lisbon, N. Dak., concerning this existing emergency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these letters may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF STATE'S ATTORNEY
OF STUTSMAN COUNTY,
Jamestown, N. Dak., July 13, 1951.

Re Stutsman County, N. Dak., farm help situation.

Re Temporary furloughs, local military personnel.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: It appears that the crop in this area is rapidly maturing and that our farmers will be in the midst of harvest somewhere around the 25th of July and that the harvest will probably continue until past the middle of September. We have a fine crop in this area with exception of a few isolated spots but the crop is not going to do our people or the country much good unless it can be harvested and saved.

There is no question about it but that there is a dire need for emergency harvest help in this area to operate threshing machines, combines, and to take care of the crop generally; our farmers are continually calling upon us to assist them in getting their sons temporarily out of the military service so that they can come home during the harvest season and help to save the bumper crop which we have here. Many of these older farmers are not at all familiar with or qualified to handle the power machinery with which our harvesting has been done the last few years due to a general labor shortage.

Would there be some way that you could use your good offices in arranging for a temporary furlough of a month to 6 weeks for Stutsman County farm boys who are in the military service and in training still in the United States. Our information is that there are at least 300 boys who are competent power farm machine operators who should be home for this harvest season and we cannot see how the country would be in any way jeopardized if these boys could be temporarily furloughed for a month to 6 weeks starting as of the 1st of August.

Yours very truly,
RUSSELL D. CHASE.

LISBON, N. DAK.,
July 19, 1951.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR LANGER: The farmers in in this area would appreciate it very much if you could make the Defense Department understand how urgent it is to grant 30-day furloughs to farm boys who have had to go into service through the draft and the National Guard, so that they might be at home to help with the harvesting of our bumper crop. Anything less than 30 days is not long enough to help with harvest for there is always the weather element to consider too, as you well know.

It is impossible to get farm labor in this community. A large group of farm boys left with the National Guard. Our high school boys who were always available in other years are working at full-time summer jobs which leaves the poor farmer alone with 400 to 500 acres of excellent crop to handle without any help. Most of them are overworked and tired out already. Their boys in service who understand the operation of the machinery and farm work are greatly needed to get this crop harvested. Sending in inexperienced labor is a hindrance and very costly in repairs to machinery which was proven a few years ago.

I have been the American Red Cross home service chairman for this county for 9 years. I have had more requests this month for help to get servicemen home than ever be-

fore. It is hard to make the parents understand that the American Red Cross does not have the authority to get the boys home, that it is entirely up to the War Department. Would it be possible for the Defense Department to make some kind of arrangement for farm furloughs? Food is a vital commodity for the war effort and the growing season very short.

The situation here is really critical. Harvest will be on in 10 days and our farmers are worried as to how they can handle it without the help of their boys.

Thank you for any assistance you can give in this matter.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. W. A. LILYQUIST.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to read a letter dated July 20, 1951, which I received from T. W. Lynch, service officer, Veterans Service Office, LaMoure, N. Dak. It reads as follows:

VETERANS SERVICE OFFICE,
LAMOURE COUNTY,
LaMoure, N. Dak., July 20, 1951.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I have had numerous individual inquiries concerning the possibility of receiving help from military personnel to harvest this year's crop. I believe that there exists a real need and hope that there is something that can be done by your office to fulfill this need.

It appears that the over-all picture of employment needs shows that workers are available. However, most of the men on these employment lists are not capable of handling the power machinery used by farmers. A type of worker who is not dependable on these machines is worse than no help at all and naturally many times as expensive.

It would be a shame to see this crop hurt even to a small extent by failure of competent labor which is now in Army camps.

Very truly yours,

T. W. LYNCH.

Although I have already brought Mrs. Lilyquist's letter to the attention of the Secretary of Defense, I cannot emphasize too strongly this threat to the Nation's welfare, which can become a reality if immediate steps are not taken to get our farm boys home from military service for a temporary period to reap the abundant harvest which we are so fortunate to have, and which will so vitally affect every civilian family and our Armed Forces in the months to come. I hope that the military authorities will take immediate action in recognition of this emergency, before it is too late.

Mr. President, I desire now to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

THE TIDELANDS OIL CONTROVERSY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I listened very carefully to the speech delivered earlier today by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] in connection with the tidelands oil question. I desire to make it very clear, in spite of the fact that numerous Senators rose and stated that they agreed with the distinguished Senator from Texas, that the senior Senator from North Dakota is unalterably opposed to the proposal with reference to tidelands oil advocated by the Senator from Texas.

In my opinion, one of the outstanding characteristics of President Truman was his absolute fearlessness prior to the last election in dealing with the tidelands oil question. If ever a man demonstrated that he could not be frightened, bullied, or influenced by others, no matter how powerful they might be, in a Democratic national convention or in any other convention, Harry Truman demonstrated it when he vetoed the tidelands oil bill.

I was interested in what the distinguished Senator from Texas had to say, because, knowing him as I do and conscious of his ability and his eloquence, I believe he would not, under any circumstances, make a statement which was not in his opinion absolutely correct. Yet, I want to invite the attention of the Senate to the veto message by President Truman. I desire to make it clear that when he vetoed the bill he was not dealing with waters inside a State at all. I now read from the veto message:

The Supreme Court's decision in the pending case will determine rights in lands lying beyond ordinary low-water mark along the coast extending seaward for a distance of 3 miles.

Listen to this:

Contrary to widespread misunderstanding, the case does not involve any tidelands, which are lands covered and uncovered by the daily ebb and flow of the tides; nor does it involve any lands under bays, harbors, ports, lakes, rivers, or other inland waters.

That is quite different from what was stated a while ago, in all good faith, I believe, by the distinguished Senator from Texas.

I read further from the veto message:

Consequently, the case does not constitute any threat to or cloud upon the titles of the several States to such lands, or the improvements thereon. When the joint resolution was being debated in the Senate an amendment was offered which would have resulted in giving an outright acquittance to the respective States of all tidelands and all lands under bays, harbors, ports, lakes, rivers, and other inland waters. Proponents of the present measure, however, defeated this amendment. This clearly emphasized that the primary purpose of the legislation was to give to the States and their lessees any right, title, or interest of the United States in the lands and minerals under the waters within the 3-mile limit.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator know of any instances in which the Federal Government has laid claim to the land under the fresh water inland lakes and rivers of the United States?

Mr. LANGER. I do not know of a single instance.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator agree that those who are in favor of giving to a few States the tidelands oil which has been declared to be the property of all the people of the United States, have been stocking inland lakes and rivers with red herrings?

Mr. LANGER. That is exactly correct. The distinguished Senator from Vermont could not have used a better expression.

Inasmuch as we are speaking about Texas, let me say what has happened. Only a short time ago Texas passed a law—providing what? It provided for laying a claim to the waters 57 miles off the coast of Texas. Why? Because in the area under those waters there were 10,000,000,000 barrels of oil. The going price at that time was $2.65 a barrel. So we have involved the staggering sum of $26,500,000,000.

Mr. President, why should an inland State, such as Vermont, or a State such as North Dakota, or a State such as South Dakota, or any other inland State, not receive its just share of that oil, 57 miles away from the coast?

The State of Louisiana passed a law under the terms of which it claimed the oil 100 miles out in the ocean from the coastline of the State.

The Supreme Court of the United States in the California case passed upon that question. After that decision was rendered an act was passed by Congress, which was vetoed. At that time the Attorney General of the United States was a man from Texas named Tom Clark. Mr. Clark brought that action directly in the Supreme Court of the United States, after first receiving permission to do so.

What have people been trying to do to Harry Truman, Mr. President? I am sorry I did not know the subject was coming up today, but when the bill is before the Senate I shall produce letters, which I have in my office, in which statements were made that unless Harry Truman backed up on tidelands oil he would lose the votes of the States bordering on the waters involved, particularly the States of Texas and California.

Mr. President, I do not know who originated the Dixiecrat Party. I read articles by some of the columnists who said that the oil companies financed the Dixiecrat Party. I remember one Senator who upon the Senate floor led a magnificent fight, as he did also in the committee. That was Senator Forrest Donnell, of Missouri. He delivered a speech upon the Senate floor which in my opinion was absolutely unanswerable. He led the fight in the Committee on the Judiciary. Yes; he was defeated, but he went to the Republican National Convention, and there, before the platform committee, of which the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] was chairman, he led the fight to keep out of the Republican Party platform, if he could, the plank which was afterward put into the platform. What took place there, Mr. President? He was defeated, he told me, by a vote of roughly 4 to 1.

Oh, there are some Senators in this body who may wonder why Harry Truman carried the Middle West. He carried it for several reasons. One was because of the great eloquence of the candidate for Vice President upon the Democratic ticket, our present distinguished Vice President, ALBEN W. BARKLEY, who was perhaps one of the best-informed men on agriculture there was in the United States, if not the best. I heard him speak over the radio at Mankato, Minn., and in Iowa. Over and above the splendid job that was done by the candidate for Vice President, the running mate of President Truman, the farmers and businessmen of the Middle West were acquainted—and we saw to it that

they were acquainted, and the Senator from North Dakota takes some credit for that—with this plank of the Republican platform, found on page 19:

We favor restoration to the States of their historic rights to the tide and submerged lands, tributary waters, lakes, and streams.

Mr. President, there is involved $26,500,000,000, and the States receive a royalty generally of from 12½ to 15 percent. I ask, Why should that money go to Texas and a couple of other States when, as a matter of fact, the Supreme Court of the United States has said that the money received from that oil belongs to all the people of the United States? Why should not the school children of North and South Dakota and of the other inland States receive their share of it based upon population? Why should not some of that money be available for schoolhouses in the inland States?

The Supreme Court of the United States has passed upon this question. It has given a clean-cut definition. The States involved have had their day in court. As the distinguished Senator from Texas said, 44 attorneys general and the American Bar Association have been in favor of the contention that the oil belongs to the States. When the tideland cases were under consideration the leading lawyers of the country presented their arguments to the Supreme Court of the United States. When they all got through, the Supreme Court of the United States held that the oil in the tidelands belonged to all the people of the United States.

Mr. President, there is no use in going into the matter at great length today, because we are not passing upon the merits of the bill referred to by the Senator from Texas, but I, for one, want to serve notice that the senior Senator from North Dakota is going to be one Senator who will be here battling for the school children and the taxpayers of the entire United States, in an effort to make sure that they shall receive their fair and just share of the tidelands oil.

Mr. President, although I have made no preparation to discuss the subject at length, I wanted to make this statement because I did not desire the statements of the senior Senator from Texas upon the Senate floor to go unchallenged.

Mr. President, I call attention to another sentence in the President's veto message:

The Attorney General advises me that the issue now before the Supreme Court has not been heretofore determined.

Senators can talk all they want to about 100 years of precedents, and about the 244 cases which have been determined. The Attorney General of the United States advised the President of this country that that was not true. As President Truman said:

It thus presents a legal question of great importance to the Nation, and one which should be decided by the Court. The Congress is not an appropriate forum to determine the legal issue now before the Court. The jurisdiction of the Supreme Court should not be interfered with while it is arriving at its decision in the pending case.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the veto message of the President in the tidewater case, which is not very long, may be printed in the RECORD at this point in full.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The veto message is as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith without my signature House Joint Resolution 225, entitled "A joint resolution to quiet the titles of the respective States, and others, to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles."

The purpose of this measure is to renounce and disclaim all right, title, interest, claim, or demand of the United States in "lands beneath tidewaters," as defined in the joint resolution, and in lands beneath all navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States, and to the minerals in such lands. The phrase "lands beneath tidewaters" is defined so broadly as to include all lands, either submerged or reclaimed, situated under the ocean beyond the low-water mark and extending out to a line three geographical miles distant from the coast line or to the boundary line of any State whose boundary, at the time of the admission of the State to the Union, extended oceanward beyond three geographical miles. Lands acquired by the United States from any State or its successors in interest, or through conveyance or condemnation, would be excluded from the operation of the measure. There would also be excluded the interest of the United States in that part of the Continental Shelf (lands under the ocean contiguous to and forming part of the land mass of our coasts) which lies more than 3 miles beyond the low-water mark or the boundary of any particular State.

On May 29, 1945, at my direction, the then Attorney General filed a suit in the United States district court at Los Angeles, in the name of the United States, to determine the rights in the land and minerals situated in the bed of the Pacific Ocean adjacent to the coast of California and within the 3-mile limit above described. Thereafter, in order to secure a more expeditious determination of the matter, the present Attorney General brought suit in the Supreme Court of the United States. The case in the district court was dismissed. I am advised by the Attorney General that the case will be heard in the Supreme Court and will probably be decided during the next term of the Court.

The Supreme Court's decision in the pending case will determine rights in lands lying beyond ordinary low-water mark along the coast extending seaward for a distance of 3 miles. Contrary to widespread misunderstanding, the case does not involve any tidelands, which are lands covered and uncovered by the daily ebb and flow of the tides; nor does it involve any lands under bays, harbors, ports, lakes, rivers, or other inland waters. Consequently the case does not constitute any threat to or cloud upon the titles of the several States to such lands, or the improvements thereon. When the joint resolution was being debated in the Senate an amendment was offered which would have resulted in giving an outright acquittance to the respective States of all tidelands and all lands under bays, harbors, ports, lakes, rivers, and other inland waters. Proponents of the present measure, however, defeated this amendment. This clearly emphasized that the primary purpose of the legislation was to give to the States and their lessees any right, title, or interest of the United States in the lands and minerals under the waters within the 3-mile limit.

The ownership of the land and resources underlying this 3-mile belt has been a subject of genuine controversy for a number of years. It should be resolved appropriately and promptly. The ownership of the vast quantity of oil in such areas presents a vital problem for the Nation from the standpoint of national defense and conservation. If the United States owns these areas, they should not be given away. If the Supreme Court decides that the United States has no title to or interest in the lands, a quitclaim from the Congress is unnecessary.

The Attorney General advises me that the issue now before the Supreme Court has not been heretofore determined. It thus presents a legal question of great importance to the Nation, and one which should be decided by the Court. The Congress is not an appropriate forum to determine the legal issue now before the Court. The jurisdiction of the Supreme Court should not be interfered with while it is arriving at its decision in the pending case.

For the foregoing reasons I am constrained to withhold my approval of the joint resolution.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 1, 1946.*

[H. J. Res. 225, 79th Cong., 1st sess.]

Joint resolution to quiet the titles of the respective States, and others, to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles

Resolved, etc., That, in recognition of the title and interest of the several States, and in others as hereinafter mentioned, since July 4, 1776, or since their formation and admission to the Union, the United States of America hereby renounces and disclaims any right, title, interest, or claim, except as hereinafter excepted and retained, in and to all lands beneath tidewaters and all lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of each of the respective States; and in further recognition of such titles and interests, the United States of America hereby releases, remises, and quitclaims all right, title, interest, claim, or demand of the United States of America in and to all lands beneath tidewaters, and all lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of each of the respective States, unto each of such States or the persons lawfully entitled thereto under the law as established by the decisions of the courts of such State, and unto the respective grantees or successors in interest thereof, and unto the respective present lawful owners of such lands of which title has been confirmed by official action of the United States of America; excepting therefrom such lands beneath tidewaters and such lands beneath navigable waters as have been lawfully acquired by the United States of America from any State or from any person in whom title had vested under the decisions of the courts of such State, or their respective grantees, or successors in interest, by cession, grant, quitclaim, or condemnation, or from any other owner or owners thereof by conveyance or by condemnation, providing such owner or owners had lawfully acquired the right, title, or interest of any such State; and excepting therefrom such lands beneath tidewaters and such lands beneath navigable waters, and such interests therein, as the United States is lawfully entitled to under the law as established by the decisions of the courts of the State in which the land is situated, or as are held by the United States in trust for the benefit of any tribe, band, or group of Indians or for individual Indians; retaining, however, to the United States of America its present powers of regulation and control for the pur-

poses of commerce, navigation, and the national defense.

As used in this joint resolution, the phrase "lands beneath tidewaters" shall include (1) all lands permanently or periodically covered by tidal waters up to but not above the line of mean high tide and oceanward to a line three geographical miles distant from the coast line and to the boundary line of each respective State where in any case such boundary line extends oceanward beyond three geographical miles, and (2) all lands formerly beneath tidewaters, as herein defined, which have been filled or reclaimed; the phrase "lands beneath navigable waters" shall include (1) all other lands covered by waters which are navigable under the laws of the United States, and (2) all lands formerly beneath navigable waters, as herein defined, which have been filled or reclaimed.

The United States excepts from this disclaimer and retains all right, title, and interest claimed and asserted by Presidential Proclamation Numbered 2667 of September 28, 1945, or otherwise to the subsoil and sea bed of or the resources in the Continental Shelf lying oceanward from the area described in the first clause (1) of the preceding paragraph.

SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President of the Senate pro tempore.

Endorsement on back of bill:

I certify that this act originated in the House of Representatives.

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to say further that I agree with every single word contained in the veto message of the President of the United States. I say again that the message proves that at a time when the enormous sum of $26,500,000,000, the value of the oil in the tidelands off the coast of Texas and Louisiana, and hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of oil off the coast of California, were involved, we had a President who was willing to and did stand firm, steadfast in behalf of the common people of the United States of America.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we are now considering the committee amendment on page 22 of the bill, are we not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). The pending amendment is the committee amendment on page 23, line 4, to strike out "$5,220,500", and insert "$5,108,603."

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Forest development roads and trails", on page 23, line 16, after the word "administration", to strike out "$11,500,000" and insert "$14,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Acquisition of lands for national forests—Weeks Act," on page 24, line 10, after "513–519, 521)", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Superior National Forest," on page 24, line 22, after "(Public Law 733)", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$150,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Special acts," on page 25, line 7, after the word "amendment", to strike out "$40,000" and insert "$39,830"; in line 19, after "(Public Law 637)", to strike out "$35,000" and insert "$34,850", and in the same line, after the words "in all", to strike out "$142,000" and insert "$141,680."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 11, to insert:

COOPERATIVE RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious plants on national forests, as authorized by section 12 of the act of April 24, 1950 (Public Law 478), $700,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Flood control," on page 27, line 6, after the word "expended", to strike out "$6,112,800" and insert "$6,372,800", and on page 28, line 1, after the word "responsibility", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further*, That not in excess of $60,000 of the funds made available herein may be used for surveys of the watersheds of the Big Nemaha River, Little Nemaha River, and Weeping Water Creek in Nebraska and such surveys shall be coordinated with the investigations of the Corps of Engineers."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Soil Conservation Service—Salaries and expenses," on page 28, line 19, after the word "installations", to strike out "and water regulation to conserve the soil and reduce fire hazards in the Everglades region of Florida, except that expenditures for all work in the Everglades region shall be limited to a sum not in excess of funds made available for such work by the State of Florida, or political subdivisions thereof."

Mr. WILLIAMS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment? As I understand, the amendment he wishes to reach is on page 29, line 9. The amendment now under consideration is on page 28, line 19.

Mr. DIRKSEN entered the Chamber.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Illinois is now present in the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware withdraw his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment on page 28, line 19, is agreed to.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 9, after the word "employees", to strike out "$54,278,000" and insert "$53,474,991."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, to the committee amendment, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 29, line 9, in lieu of the figure proposed to be inserted by the committee, it is proposed to insert the figure "$40,600,000."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the amendment to the amendment is very simple. In substance, it would reduce by roughly $13,000,000 the amount which was allowed by the Senate committee. This is a cut in the item for soil conservation, which is distinguished from soil conservation and domestic allotment in that the later item, of course, deals with soil-conservation payments which are made to farmers. This item of soil conservation is esesntially a personnel item. As I recall, roughly 85 percent of the entire appropriation is devoted to the payment of salaries of those engaged in the field, not only in experimental and demonstration work, but in the practical work of teaching farmers soil-conservation practices.

For the fiscal year 1952 I understand that the budget estimate indicates that there will be 11,825 persons engaged in this work in various sections of the country. It occurs to me that when we reach an item like that—and I have watched soil conservation grow from $10,000,000 to well over $53,000,000—the time has come to stop and ask a few questions, to determine whether or not there is duplication of service, and whether or not, in the interest of a balanced budget and in the interest of drying up some of the public expenditures which go into the economic stream of the country and thereby become an inflationary force, a reduction could be made. I believe that such an item should be viewed with a very careful and baleful eye.

In my judgment, the proposed cut would not do too much harm to the Soil Conservation Service, notwithstanding the fact that there will be many cries to the effect that we are crippling the service, and that competent and practiced employees will have to find work elsewhere unless they are shifted to some other bureau in the Department of Agriculture.

I took the trouble to examine rather carefully all the testimony in the House hearings, and I also examined the testimony which was given before the Senate committee. I see by the tables which have been inserted in the RECORD that the soil conservation work is very, very far from completion, and far from a 100-percent job. In the State of the very distinguished majority leader [Mr. MCFARLAND] the figures indicate that the Soil Conservation Service officials themselves say that only 1 percent of the goal has been achieved.

The great and good sovereign State of Georgia is, I believe, at the top of the heap, in that about 38 percent of the

tillable land has been reached by the practices which are taught and demonstrated by the Soil Conservation Service. But there are some 22 States in which this work is at a level less than 10 percent of completion. So, while a cut may delay the program a little, it cannot be very persuasively argued that such a cut would particularly harm the program or set it back very much.

The second argument which I make in behalf of reducing this appropriation is that in my considered judgment the States ought to do more of this character of work. When all is said and done, the States have an interest. Their interest is not remote from the land. After all, the land is within the confines of the States. If this work is so important as it is said to be—and I attach the necessary importance to it—it seems to me that the States could do a great deal more in the field than they have done.

I notice from the tables which have been inserted in the hearings, both on the House side and on the Senate side, that the sum total of State aid in the soil conservation field is about $10,000,000. That is something less than 20 percent of the outlay which the Federal Government is making for personal services in this field. It is worthy of note that the highway program which was instituted back in 1916 was placed on a matching basis. Various other grants in aid to the States were put on a matching basis. Yet in this instance the Federal Government is doing roughly 80 percent of the work, while the States do 20 percent, or even less. It seems that in a spirit of reexamination we ought to look at it a little more closely, and there should be some insistence on the part of the Federal Government and the appropriate agencies in the Department of Agriculture that the States give some attention to this subject and devote both time and money to the conservation of soil within the limits of the States.

The third reason which I assign for a rather substantial cut in this field is that there is a rather interesting conflict in agricultural policy. We have one agency, the Soil Conservation Service, with more than 11,000 employees going forth and teaching practices designed to conserve the topsoil, to prevent wind erosion and rain erosion, to prevent the soil fom leaching away and getting into the watercourses and going into the Gulf of Mexico. They are doing all the necessary things in order to preserve the fertility of the soil and the alluvial topcrust of soil, which is indispensable, of course, to a productive agriculture. But while that is going on, we have in the selfsame Department of Agriculture policies which are designed to deplete the soil.

I know there are some farmers in my own State of Illinois who would not be too happy to hear me say this, but as I have gone around the country—and I have examined my State pretty carefully in the past 2 years—I have looked into the situation. I could take Senators to almost any crossroads, and there, gleaming in the moonlight, show them polished, corrugated containers, most of which hold about a thousand bushels of corn. They can be found by the thousands all through the Corn Belt. In those cans there is something more than corn which has been sealed under a Federal policy. In those cans is some of the soil from the great and good Middle West. With support prices, it is up to a farmer to determine whether or not he can do better raising corn for grain and selling it in the market, or whether it had better go into meat, in the form of beef or pork, and reach the palates of consumers in that way. But no matter how it gets there, it represents, in a sense, a soil-depleting crop. It seems to me that so long as the present types of separate policies prevail, we are going to have farmers who will be less interested in dairying, which is probably one of the most efficient ways to use the produce of the soil, and who will give more and more attention to the feeding of livestock and the production of pork.

The point I am making is that there is one agency giving time, attention, and utilizing very substantial Federal appropriations to conserve the soil. Then we turn around, and we fail to give proper accent to a properly balanced policy which would put an end to soil depletion.

Mr. President, I believe we are standing at the point where we ought to examine plans, bring about harmony in the policies, and find out whether we are on the wrong track. The only way to do it is to take away some of the money and curtail some of the practices until we can get a far better look at the problem.

The next point I would make in behalf of a $13,000,000 cut in the soil-conservation fund is that the time has come to give far more attention to the question of duplication in the Department of Agriculture. What I am about to say, I say with considerable modesty. At the same time, I beg the Senate's pardon when I allude to the fact that at one time I served at the other end of the Capitol, that for 12 years I served on the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, and as chairman of the subcommittee during one Congress. I was very much concerned, of course, about the duplicating activities and overlapping functions of the Department of Agriculture.

I submit to the Senate that at the present time there are in the field roughly 12,000 paid personnel, who are on the staff of the Extension Service. They have a variety of functions and duties, not the least of which is to guide, instruct, and educate farmers, and to diffuse information and knowledge with respect to proper and adequate soil-conservation practices. So there are 12,000 persons in the Extension Service. There are an estimated 11,825 persons in the Soil Conservation Service. That does not include the work which is being done by special groups. It does not include the work being done in this particular field by the agencies under the leadership of the Production and Marketing Administration.

Mr. President, I submit it is duplication which fills the counties of the country with employees who, in my considered judgment, are carrying on functions which overlap and come in conflict with those of other agencies, as well as generate friction in the field.

I should like to read a portion of an article, with which I believe most Members of the Senate are familiar. It appeared in the Country Gentleman magazine. It bears out pretty nearly the facts which were adduced by the task force of the so-called Hoover Commission, which, in pursuance of authority in the Lodge-Brown resolution, carried on a very extensive exploration of the whole executive structure of the Government. Among other things, this is what they say about one county in Illinois. Incidentally, it is a very selected county, with fine soil, with diligent farmers, and with men of capability and intelligence in the field of agriculture who know what they are doing. I read from the report which relates to De Kalb County, Ill. It appeared in the March, 1950, issue of the Country Gentleman. It says:

> Twenty-five of the best farmers in De Kalb County, Ill., were asked this question: "What would be your rough guess as to the number of Federal farm-agency employees—either part of full time—in De Kalb County in 1949?"
>
> Their average guess was 56 Federal hired hands in their midst. And 21 of the 25 farmers went on to say that this was too many.
>
> They were flabbergasted when they were told the right answer was more than three times their guess. For 178 men and women were working for the Federal Government in De Kalb County last year—just to tell farmers what they should do, what they can do, and, in some instances, what they cannot do.
>
> These 178 persons put in part or full time, and were paid from $8 a day up to $5,350 a year. They worked only on the various Federal service programs inside that one county. One hundred and twenty-three of them actually live right in the county; 55 of them live outside the county but regularly visited as part of their duties. Jobholders in State, regional, and National bureaus, who influence but never see De Kalb County were not even counted.
>
> It took 65 De Kalb men and 5 girls a total of 590 days to sign up, check performance, figure up results, and pay out $35.01 apiece to farmers who cooperated in the Government's PMA program.

I inject parenthetically to say to my esteemed and able friend from Georgia that these were ACP payments. For one county they averaged $35.01. A large expense was involved to pay those who checked performance, produced the checks, had them signed and appropriately delivered to the farmers in that county. Knowing the type of agriculture and the type of husbandmen who live in that county, the payment of $35, in my humble judgment, would certainly not make the difference between an interest and a noninterest in soil conservation practices.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the Senator give us the proportion of the total number of employees who are local committeemen and county committemen, who work part time on a daily basis or a few days a month?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Quite a number of them.

Mr. RUSSELL. Quite a number of them?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe the great majority of them are part-time committeemen who are elected by the farmers themselves, to administer the farm program. They may have two men in De Kalb County, Ill. The Senator knows that the compensation of the local committeemen and county committeemen comes out of the funds which are allocated to the counties for soil conservation payments. It may be that in the particular county referred to, out of the 3,000 or more counties in the United States, too large a part of the payments are taken and too many committeemen are hired to do the work. If so, it is a most extraordinary county, and I assume that is the reason it was emphasized so much in the report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have not refreshed myself on the figure for several years, but when I last looked it up and had cognizance of it, there were 108,000 county and community committeemen in the entire country. If I am incorrect, I shall be glad to stand corrected.

Mr. RUSSELL. The figure is almost as extravagant as I believe to be the statement which the Senator is now reading.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest that the Senator from Georgia look up the figures with respect to the entire part-time employment situation in the Department.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have the figures before me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to have my memory refreshed with respect to the figures.

Mr. RUSSELL. All of the county employees, including county committeemen, on a temporary basis, number 102,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not miss it by very much, I said 108,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thought the Senator said 160,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I said 108,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. I misunderstood the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not having seen the figure for 3 years I believe I was pretty close to the exact figure. Perhaps the number has been cut down in some counties. I believe I can answer in part the Senator's inquiry by reading a little further from the article before me. This goes to the particular matter with which the amendment is concerned:

> The Soil Conservation Service's bill was $14,040 for offering technical advice to 95 farmers—3.8 percent of those in the county. That's a cost of about $147.68 each. One "cooperator" admitted: "Oh, I just signed up to get their soil map—I'm not following the rotation they set up for my farm."
>
> Farmers get free advice on crop rotation from at least three different Government agencies. In some instances 5, and yet more than 100 De Kalb County farmers have put up $40 apiece to hire their own farm-management consultant.

Evidently they were not too well satisfied with the kind of service they were getting from the Government, so they simply dug into their own pocketbooks and got a consultant of their own.

> Congress says the Extension Service shall carry out all educational programs in farming. Yet in De Kalb County, the Soil Conservation Service is primarily educational and spends three times as much as Extension. Two full-time men with salaries totaling $7,760, plus six others who work part-time in De Kalb County, and drive five Government cars, offer farmer cooperators soil maps which most farmers want, plus advice, mainly on rotation, which many do not follow.

Mr. President, I think I can draw upon my own experience in years gone by when I examined this entire picture of duplication. I remember all of the queries we addressed to the Extension Service. I remember the bill we introduced, which was considered by the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives. That bill dealt with this very subject, because the duplication which existed was becoming a matter of acute concern to Members of Congress.

I think I can proceed now to prove the point even further and to indicate that today there are some areas of friction which in my considered judgment are rather unhappy.

I believe my friend, the Senator from Georgia, will recall that both last year and this year the House Appropriations Committee selected four or five investigators and put them into the field. As I understand, they had no connection whatsoever with the Department of Agriculture. They were men of some talent and some research ability and some exploratory capacity, and they were sent into the field to check on the coordination or lack of coordination and the harmony or lack of harmony in these programs.

They have filed a very interesting report. I tried to get the full text of the report; but I understand that, by agreement among the members of the committee at the other end of the Capitol, the report has not yet been released. However, some rather generous excerpts from it were included in the House hearings. I shall read now only the portions which probably are pertinent to the item now before us, although, if it is desired, I shall of course be delighted to place in the RECORD as much of the report as I have been able to procure. I hope the entire report will be printed in the RECORD, because I think it is extremely useful and informative.

The following excerpt from the report appears in the House hearings—and these are the findings of these detached, unbiased investigators who were sent out by the committee:

> The national soil conservation program, as currently administered by the United States Department of Agriculture, is permeated with duplication, overlap, conflict, and lack of coordination, and what has been aptly described as a state of "civil war" exists in many areas between the Extension Service, the agricultural conservation program branch of Production and Marketing Administration, Soil Conservation Service, and Farmers Home Administration. All of these bureaus, with the exception of the Farmers Home Administration, are competing for control of this program due to the rising importance of conservation in the national economy—and service to the American farmer suffers. This situation was found to exist in the majority of the States and counties visited.

Mr. President, I think that is a rather serious indictment of what is taking place in these functional operations in the field, under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture at the present time.

The report continues as follows:

> In most of the States visited, the Extension Service, as a matter of policy, is strongly opposing not only the work being done by the Soil Conservation Service, but also is in active opposition to the formation of additional soil conservation districts.

Mr. President, I should say that is rather interesting. When sweetness and light and harmony finally fade away like an old soldier, and the agencies begin to fight each other and resist each other's programs, it is rather interesting for us to know of that situation.

I read further from the report:

> The policy was confirmed in conversations with the deans of the State colleges of agriculture and the directors of extension services. In one State, this bitter opposition has taken the form of Extension Service instigated suits in State courts to prevent the formation of soil conservation districts and thinly disguised propaganda campaigns against the Soil Conservation Service. A typical propaganda handbill which was placed under the mail box of each farmer in one county on the night preceding a soil conservation referendum is as follows:

Mr. President, this is very interesting. The caption of the handbill is:

> Farmers—Farm Owners.
> Stop—Look—Listen.

This is the handbill which was circulated:

> Do you remember?
> 1. When Henry Wallace drowned all the little pigs.
> 2. When Henry Wallace made us get permits to sell our wheat?
> He also got the pet idea about us using soil districts.
> What may a soil district bring to Perry County?
> 1. Two to five high-priced white-collar men working in the county.
> 2. Higher taxes.
> 3. Centralized Washington control.
> 4. Dictatorship, bureaucratic control.
> 5. Strangle free enterprise: (a) Force local contractors out of business.
> (b) Kill individual initiative on the farm.
> The Perry County farmer has prospered on the basis of free enterprise. Our forefathers came to this country so that this freedom might be theirs. We had better be fearful for the future of our country if we expect the Government to take care of us.

Mr. President, I shall place the remainder of the handbill in the RECORD, but I think what I have read is sufficient to indicate the rather interesting lack of felicity between the Soil Conservation Service, on the one hand, and the Extension Service in the field, on the other. One has 11,825 persons in the field and the other has 12,000 persons in the field, and, of course, that is exclusive of what is done in this particular field of operations by other agencies in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Was that handbill circulated by the Extension Service?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, it was; that is the interesting thing about it.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator mind telling us where Perry County is?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Frankly, I do not know. I tried to get a copy of the report, and this morning I telephoned the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations about it. They were going to take the matter under advisement.

It could be Perry County, Ill., for aught I know. However, I do not know.

Mr. AIKEN. It sounds more like a feud between the Soil Conservation Service and the Production and Marketing Administration rather than with the Extension Service. However, of course, anything can happen in the Central States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, there is something here on that phase of the matter; I read the following from page 690 of the House hearings:

> Typical of the current conflict between Soil Conservation Service and Production and Marketing Administration, the following are the chronological events which normally happen when a farmer builds terraces on his farm—

Mind you, Mr. President, this is taken from the investigator's report. There was one report last year and there was one report this year. As I have said, I am simply quoting from the report, which the House committee inserted in the hearings. This is what the report says:

> 1. He will come to the office of the Extension Service and request advice. The Extension Service will refer the farmer to the local PMA office.
>
> 2. The local PMA office will advise the farmer as to whether or not funds are available to pay for this conservation practice and if such funds are available, the farmer is advised that a PMA representative will be sent to inspect the area on his farm which he desires terraced. After inspection and approval by a PMA representative, the farmer may then go to the local office of Soil Conservation Service.

Is that borne out by the experience of my friend, the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, that is the procedure, as I understand it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Now we come to the third point in the investigator's report:

> 3. At the Soil Conservation Service office the farmer is advised that no terracing work can be done on his farm by the Soil Conservation Service until a land-utilization survey has been made and a farm plan developed. After the development of such a plan, Soil Conservation Service will then send technical representatives to the farm to stake out the necessary contour lines.

That is item No. 3.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question, if he will yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator recall that in June, 1948, the Senate passed a bill which was intended to correct the very situation to which the Senator from Illinois is referring, and of which he has given an accurate description; but the House flatly refused to have anything to do with that measure; the House would not cooperate at all. The House killed the bill; and in order to obtain any law at all on agriculture at that time, we had to give up that effort. However, the Senate passed the bill by a vote of 78 or 81 to 3; there were only 3 votes in the Senate against the bill.

If the House had only cooperated with the Senate at that time, although probably we would not have corrected the situation completely, at least we would have gone a long way toward correcting it.

The situation is bad. All the agencies are trying to do educational work, to teach the farmers to think their way. As a matter of fact, the Extension Service is the educational and informational agency; and, of course, it operates through the States. The Soil Conservation Service is an operational agency, and it has to be set up by the States. The PMA comes in, of course, under the price-support program.

I want to make it plain that I agree with the Senator from Illinois that the situation is bad. Certainly, coming from the State of Illinois, he knows how bad it can be in certain spots; and it must be corrected. I agree with the Senator in that respect. But I did want to point out that, so far as the Senate is concerned, we tried once to correct the condition.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My friend from Vermont will remember that at one time the condition was even more aggravated than at present; for in the days of the Farm Security Administration, under the leadership of that very distinguished liberal—ultraliberal, shall I say?—C. B. Baldwin, who later became the campaign manager for Mr. Wallace, they had up to 20,000 people on the rolls, and they were dabbling in about every kind of agricultural function of which man has any knowledge, including functions in this field. Where they were going, running on different tracks toward one goal, was more than the Senator from Illinois could comprehend in those days. He tried his best, of course, to have the situation straightened out, and to have the particular appropriations reduced; but it was a difficult business, to say the least.

I might add that very recently—in fact, only last March, I think it was—the Secretary of Agriculture took some steps which, it was claimed, would eliminate some of this competition. But, unfortunately, he came under suspicion by all the different groups, apparently; and I would not say that he was getting anywhere very fast. This is a situation which has to be by legislation. I do not think any Secretary of Agriculture can effect the reforms needed and get by with them. He is going to have sabotage and insurrection within his own ranks when he tries it. I hope that it will be one of the early tasks of this Congress to correct the situation which the Senator from Illinois is accurately describing here today.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Putting it in the form of a question, I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Illinois is familiar with the very fine job which Henry Wallace and Mr. Baldwin did for the Middle West when they were in charge of the Agricultural Department. The distinguished Senator will remember that during that time we had several terrible years of drought. At least, in my State they faced the problem of saving the foundation herds. They had to ascertain what cattle should be killed. I was Governor of the State at that time, and I know the great job they had to do. In my own experience, I may say, I had cattle for which I myself paid $75 a head which were taken to the sandpits and shot, and I received a check for $17 apiece.

The Senator from North Dakota fought the program of Henry Wallace to plow under every third row of cotton and wheat, but the program did accomplish one thing. The Department of Agriculture taught the farmers in the Middle West the value of strip farming and of contour plowing. The result has been that we have now had 12 years of the most magnificent crops we have ever had in the history of North Dakota. Of course, we have had rain.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was going to make that suggestion.

Mr. LANGER. We have had rain, but I doubt whether, had we not had strip farming and contour plowing, even with the rain we have had, we would have had the remarkable crops which have been harvested. The farmers of my State realize that, whatever they may think about Mr. Wallace's views. I might add he did not get a very large vote in North Dakota, as the distinguished Senator knows. The farmers did not admire his politics, but they did like the way he managed the Department of Agriculture, and I think it only fair to say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois exactly what the facts are in that connection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would have given a slightly modified answer to my friend from North Dakota, first, by saying it would be astonishing, indeed, if an administrator in Government who had a background in agriculture such as Mr. Wallace had could not accomplish at least some good, even though it were nothing more than to eradicate Bang's disease from the dairy herds of the country, and to carry on the functions of plant entomology and quarantine, or finally, to offset moon-blindness in horses. Oh, there are a thousand and one things in the scientific field which could be done. I certainly do not agree, however, to the proposition that it is either sound or wise to throw pigs into tankage in the belief that, by diminishing the supply, the country would be taken out of the deflationary spiral in

which it was at that time; and I would be the first to admit, in the interest of truth and candor, that that was the condition at that time.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator understands that I fought that part of the program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I understand that. I know something of the condition which existed on the Dakota prairies. I remember that, as a student, I used to sell stock books in South Dakota. I saw the drought come, and, inside of 48 hours, one could see 320 acres of wheat on the stem come to nothing, so that it would not bring the price of a cotton suit of clothes.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have seen that happen in the Dakotas. As one who has had a good deal to do during the past 8 or 9 years with agricultural crops, I must say I have not the slightest doubt, of course, that contour plowing, strip farming, and the other devices——

Mr. LANGER. Better seed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And better seed, have improved the yields of the Dakota prairies; that I do know.

Here we are dealing with the question of inflation, and, if we fail to stop it now, and let it go deeper and deeper by making constantly increasing appropriations, when will we get out of this welter? We often say, "Oh, you must use the scalpel; you must pinpoint your economies." I am not so sure but that the medicine which is furnished by a good, ready, sharp ax is about what the Government needs, if we are to put it in order and keep the budget within proper dimensions.

To recapitulate, what was in this report. First of all, a farmer is taken through the courses.

First, he goes to the Extension Service and asks for advice, and they send him to PMA. He then goes to PMA, he makes other representations there, and they finally say, "You must go to the Soil Conservation Service."

Then comes No 4:

4. The farmer then must recontract PMA who sends another representative to the farm to measure the lines staked out by SCS and issue a formal permit before construction of the terraces is begun.

5. Soil Conservation Service then advises and assists in the actual construction of the terraces.

6. The farmer must again contact PMA who sends another representative to the farm to check the job and certify it for payment.

That is a fine kettle of fish. He almost gets lost in his own perplexity and in his own bewilderment, as he contacts first one agency and then another, in the same county, getting a diversity and a variety of advice. At long last, out of this professional welter, the job is done and payment is made.

It is no wonder that the farmers of De Kalb County finally went into their pockets for $40 apiece and hired a consultant of their own.

Conditions are becoming such that some of the employees of the Department are beginning to fall over each other, and I think the time has come, Mr. President, for a little examination. When all is said and done, the Congress under the Constitution is the exclusive authority, with power over the purse. The sword was entrusted to one branch of government; the purse to another. We cannot shunt that obligation or that responsibility to someone else. If duplication exists and the investigators, who were certainly not of my choosing and my naming, find it out, if they find overlapping functions to abound in the field service, then the thing to do is to use the knife and plunge it deeply and make that the starting point for a further survey of this question before the duplication goes too far.

Mr. President, I could read from other portions of the report, but it would be repetitive in character and would probably not add very much to the whole story. I think the time has come to cut the appropriation.

A few days ago I looked at a little survey of what has happened and what the box score is in the field of appropriations thus far in this session of the Eighty-second Congress. The House has passed six appropriation bills, I believe, including the first defense bill. They have shown savings under the budget of, roughly, $1,100,000,000. Three regular appropriation bills have now been acted upon by the Senate. In the independent offices bill we raised the House figure by $77,000,000, and we reduced the Labor-Federal Security bill by $113,000,000. But that, in my judgment, was only an illusory saving, because I think my friend from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] pointed out at the time that the money is taken out of a fund where there is going to be a build-up of the case load, and it is fair to assume that before the year is out the agency will be here asking for a deficiency appropriation. So the saving is probably more apparent than real.

So, Mr. President, I renew the question I have raised from time to time in my rather humble and feeble way: Where are we going to bring about the billions of dollars in economy to which we have so frequently alluded? Where are the billions of dollars in reductions and savings which we have suggested to the people of the country in the hope that we could ease the tax load upon the suffering taxpayers? When all is said and done, the taxpayer is still the forgotten man, even though it has been made to appear by glamor and rhetoric that the forgotten man is some rather mythical character. I remind the Senate that 68 years ago, when Dr. Sumner, of Yale University, wrote a series of treatises, he wrote one which was called The Forgotten Man, and the man he meant was the taxpayer who votes, who prays, and who pays.

So, Mr. President, wherever there is an opportunity I am going to lift my voice in the hope that some modest economies can be developed, so we can keep the budget in balance in the next fiscal year, God willing and I say it reverently—because if there is a more inflationary force, if there is a greater public inflationary force than debt and additions to that debt—and our public debt is already astronomical in its dimensions—I do not know what it is. I think there is a solemn personal duty on the part of anyone who has been elected to public office to leave nothing undone to see that all the relief is afforded that can be brought about.

Mr. President, I wish to allude to one thing that was referred to when my able friend from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] earlier gave his very interesting discourse from the charts. I think he sought to establish that cuts in the agricultural budget were certainly comparable personnelwise, and so far as administrative expenses were concerned, with the other appropriation bills——

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not say that it was cut to the same extent that the other bills have been. I made no comparison. I stated that the Department of Agriculture had had its appropriations reduced since prewar days, whereas other departments of the Government had obtained substantial increases since the war period. I stated that the Department of Agriculture had 13,000 fewer permanent employees than was the case in 1940. I should like to have someone suggest some other department of the Government which has fewer permanent employees today than it had in 1940.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I trust the Senate will not be deterred by its failure with respect to other appropriation bills. I think the cuts should have been much deeper. That is why I voted against some of them. I should not hesitate to let the knife go in deeply if there is any occasion to do so, where it can be done without doing a grave injustice to agriculture or harm to the agricultural function. I do not think we should impair the productivity of American agriculture. I believe savings can be effected, and if I did not believe so, I would not want to jeopardize the basic industry of agriculture, upon which so many persons depend.

There is a sense of independence in the American farmer, for what he does is something more than a business; it is something more than the making of a mere livelihood taken out of the soil. The farmer pursues a calling which is essentially a way of life, but it does breed a sense of independence in him, and he does not ask for "Mr. Whiskers," better known as Uncle Sam, to take him by the hand and lead him constantly down the path. He knows his business. He has been coping with chinchbugs and the vagaries of the weather for years, and he has done pretty well in bringing agriculture to its present high state. We should let the farmer alone.

Agricultural organizations have suggested that the knife should cut more deeply. To be sure, I should say in fairness that they have not suggested specifically the amendment which is on the desk, but I am glad to observe that the American Farm Bureau Federation and the Illinois Agricultural Association, with more than 150,000 paid-up active members, are becoming very conscious indeed of the necessity for economy, and they have put their weight behind some economy.

I have not forgotten that in 1947 I had an opportunity to observe agricultural practices in Germany where they were

carried to a very high degree. They had to do it because the contant cropping of the soil, century after century, made it necessary to conserve every ounce of fertility of the soil. But what did it amount to when they went through the inflationary period, when the value of the mark went to nothing, when there were 177,000,000,000 paper marks, and the Government had to take the ax and chop up 90 percent of all the marks in circulation and get what was in every man's purse and bank account?

Let us not be so naive as to say "it can't happen here." It can happen here. At one time there was a little more than 20 grains of gold in the American dollar, and the dollar would buy a dollar's worth of merchandise. Today a dollar will buy 54 cents worth of merchandise. There are some very sound, orthodox economists who say the dollar will go down even further.

I believe, then, that there is a solemn duty on the Congress to make sure that wherever possible we cut the budget so as to make sure that there may not befall this pleasant country the same kind of destiny which Germany suffered.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unaminous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TEMPORARY NATIONAL COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill (S. 1146) to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations was passed on the call of the calendar yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be entered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I now move that the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate all papers in respect to that bill.

The motion was agreed to.

CREATION OF COMMISSION TO STUDY ADMINISTRATION OF OVERSEAS ACTIVITIES OF THE GOVERNMENT—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I enter a similar motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate yesterday, on the call of the calendar, passed the bill (S. 1166) to create a commission to make a study of the administration of overseas activities of the Government, and to make recommendations to Congress with respect thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be entered.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator state to what the bill refers?

Mr. ELLENDER. Senate bill 1166, which would create a commission to make a study of the administration of overseas activities of the Government, and to make recommendations to Congress with respect thereto.

Mr. President, I now move that the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate all papers relating to that bill.

The motion was agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. McFARLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader a question. The order for a quorum call was rescinded. Does that mean that the vote on the Dirksen amendment will go over until tomorrow?

Mr. McFARLAND. To be frank about the matter, Mr. President, the quorum call was rescinded because it was thought it would take some time to obtain a quorum. I desire to give notice now that Senators must be expected to wait upon the Senate until at least 6 o'clock in the evening, or we shall never finish with the work of the Congress. I give notice that Senators should be present tomorrow until at least 6 o'clock, or perhaps later. We want to finish consideration of the pending bill, and consider other appropriation bills. The only way we can transact business is to have a quorum present. I give notice now that tomorrow quorum calls when suggested will not be withdrawn.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. There was some confusion in the Chamber, and I did not hear the request for unanimous consent to withdraw the quorum call, or I certainly would have objected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Idaho that the request was made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and no objection was heard.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I regret that sincerely, because during the progress of the quorum call I observed on the floor of the Senate four or five Senators who last night flew for many hours throughout the night to return from a trip of inspection of the flood damages in the Middle West. If Members of the Senate can remain on a plane all night in order to get back to Washington to discharge their duties, I fail to comprehend why a quorum call should be withdrawn, and why we should not proceed with the business before the Senate.

Again I wish to protest against the delay which we are encountering day after day in the conduct of business. It is the duty of Members of the Senate to be present, instead of penalizing those who remain on the job.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I will say to my good friend from Idaho that ordinarily the Senate adjourns or takes a recess somewhere between 5 and 6 o'clock. If it had not been for the fact that we had reached the hour of 5 o'clock, I myself would have objected to withdrawing the quorum call. I am just as anxious to transact business as is any other Senator. But when we reach the hour of 5 o'clock, and it is obvious that some time will be required to obtain a quorum, I think we can expedite matters by adjourning or taking a recess.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The statement made by the distinguished majority leader is, of course, correct, unless notice has been given of a late session. I hope the Senator from Arizona will serve notice upon the Senate tomorrow, as he has done today, that the Senate may remain in session until a late hour tomorrow. Consideration of appropriation bills should be concluded by the Senate, because they all must go to conference, and the conferences may require some time. Most of the appropriation bills are already about a month late. So I hope the distinguished Senator from Arizona will serve notice tomorrow that the Senate may remain in session until a late hour unless we conclude action on the appropriation bill. After the Senator has served such notice, I shall certainly object to any withdrawal of a quorum call.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not believe that Senators are entirely to blame for not being present this evening after 5 o'clock, because there was some thought that there would not be a vote on the bill today. Some Senators thought that because a number of amendments were going over business would not be transacted at a late hour. However, I serve notice now that the Senate may remain in session until at least 7 o'clock tomorrow evening. If it appears tomorrow that we may be in session at a later hour, I shall serve notice again. I ask Senators to be present until at least 7 o'clock, if necessary, to complete consideration of the bill tomorrow.

A NEW WAY OF HANDLING THE BUDGET

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Washington Evening Star of today carries a story entitled "Senators Seek Another Way To Handle Budget—Committee Begins Study of Third Such Plan in Recent Years."

The story reads, in part, as follows:

A better method of handling the Government's growing annual budget may be recommended to Congress today by the Senate Expenditures Committee.

Chairman McCLELLAN called the committee into closed session this morning to consider a bill to improve the facilities of the House and Senate for delving into the details which make up the billions of dollars in the annual appropriation bills.

The committee is understood to have made some headway at a preliminary meeting last week and is expected to take final action on a new budget procedure bill today.

One of several plans under consideration would set up a joint committee on the budget, similar to the joint committee the two Houses have maintained for many years to study taxes.

Mr. President, I ask that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATORS SEEK ANOTHER WAY TO HANDLE BUDGET—COMMITTEE BEGINS STUDY OF THIRD SUCH PLAN IN RECENT YEARS

(By J. A. O'Leary)

A better method of handling the Government's growing annual budget may be recommended to Congress today by the Senate Expenditures Committee.

Chairman MCCLELLAN called the committee into closed session this morning to consider a bill to improve the facilities of the House and Senate for delving into the details which make up the billions of dollars in the annual appropriation bills.

The committee is understood to have made some headway at a preliminary meeting last week and is expected to take final action on a new budget procedure bill today.

One of several plans under consideration would set up a joint committee on the budget, similar to the joint committee the two Houses have maintained for many years to study taxes.

TWO EARLIER PLANS FAILED

Congress in recent years has tried two new plans for promoting economy and bringing about more orderly handling of appropriation bills, but both were discarded after trial runs. The McClellan committee, which recently held hearings on a wide range of congressional reforms, hopes to come up with a more lasting solution.

The first experiment was the budget ceiling clause in the Congressional Reorganization Act of 1946. It directed both Houses to agree at the start of each session on a top-limit for the budget as a whole. This ceiling was to be established before the detailed appropriations for each department were considered. It was to bear some relation to the Government's expected income.

For 2 years an effort was made to carry out the ceiling law, but with little success. The two Houses wrangled over the height of the ceiling. Finally it fell into disuse.

ONE-PACKAGE IDEA ABANDONED

The second experiment was the one-package money bill of last year, which was abandoned this year. Chairman CANNON of the House Appropriations Committee and Chairman BYRD of the Joint Committee on Non-Essential Expenditures believe the one-package plan was a success.

It was scrapped, however, when administration leaders joined with Republicans in the House to override the Appropriations Committee at the start of the 1951 session.

This made it necessary for the House and Senate to return this year to the old system of bringing out a dozen separate departmental bills, and Congress is far behind its normal schedule in disposing of them. Although the appropriation bills are supposed to be laws by July 1, not a single 1952 supply bill has been completed. It probably will be late in August before the money bills are all on President Truman's desk.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the last statement to which I have referred is:

One of several plans under consideration would set up a joint committee on the budget, similar to the joint committee the two Houses have maintained for many years to study taxes.

I am quite satisfied that that refers to Senate bill 913, entitled "A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States."

The bill reads in part as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

"SEC. 138. (a) There is hereby created a joint service committee, to be known as the Joint Committee on the Budget (hereinafter in this section called the Joint Committee) and to be composed of 10 members as follows:

"(1) Five members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, three from the majority party and two from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee; and"—

It goes on with the details of the so-called plan, which is an amendment to section 138 (a), which is a rule of both Houses, under which we are now operating.

It is my understanding that the reason why this particular bill was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, is found in the fact that it is provided, in section 102 (1) (g), subdivision (2), that:

Such committee shall have the duty of—

* * * * *

(B) studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency.

With that I have no quarrel. That is the job of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department. But, inasmuch as the bill would amend sections 138 (a), if Senate bill 913 is the one referred to in the article, it very definitely would amend a rule. For that reason, in my humble opinion, the bill at least should be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration before it comes to the Senate, if it should be reported at all to the Senate. My feeling is that the Committee on Rules and Administration has complete jurisdiction of such proposal.

I wish to state to the distinguished presiding officer and Members of the Senate that 4 years ago, and continuously since then the junior Senator from Nebraska, working with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], submitted a concurrent resolution which contains almost exactly what is contained in the bill, except that it takes members from four committees of the Senate and the House, instead of from two committees of the Senate and the House; that is, not only from the Committees on Appropriations, but from the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House.

I am not quarreling on the ground of any pride of authorship. As a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration I wish to state that the membership of the committee has spent a great deal of time in studying the kind of committee which we desire to set up in both Houses, which would be a legislative committee similar in purpose to the Bureau of the Budget of the executive arm of the Government, to keep us informed at all times, day in and day out, with reference to governmental expenditures and receipts. That is the purpose of the bill and of the concurrent resolution.

I feel that inasmuch as all the concurrent resolutions on this subject which have been offered in the past, as well as the bills on the subject which have been introduced, have in former years been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, this particular bill, which has been stated will be brought up—and I take it reference is made to S. 913—should be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration for further study. That is the committee which has jurisdiction of the subject matter.

The committee had done a considerable amount of work, long before this bill was ever introduced, on a proposition which to my mind is identical with the one contained in S. 913, with the exception that the concurrent resolution submitted by the junior Senator from Nebraska in years gone by and again this year provides for a committee to consist of members of four legislative committees, instead of members from two committees.

I make that statement with the deepest respect for the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. I feel that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments should make the studies. That is the job of the committee. However, after the studies have been made I feel the proposed legislation should be referred to the committee which has jurisdiction, namely, the Committee on Rules and Administration, and that committee should report a bill or bills, if any, for the consideration of the Senate.

Once again, Mr. President, I claim no pride of authorship. That is not what is involved at all. As the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration I believe it is my job to call the matter to the attention of the Members of the Senate. While we have no objection to the studies being made—and I say they should be made by the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments—before a bill is reported to the Senate it should be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. Whatever legislation is recommended ought to come from the Committee on Rules and Administration. I think the distinguished majority leader for giving me an opportunity to bring the subject to the attention of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 913 be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. It is the bill which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 913) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

"SEC. 138. (a) There is hereby created a joint service committee, to be known as the Joint Committee on the Budget (hereinafter in this section called the 'joint committee')

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 25 (legislative day, JULY 24), 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. BYRD (for himself and Mr. FERGUSON) to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 65, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

"SEC. 411. No part of the money appropriated for the Department of Agriculture by this Act or made available for expenditure by any corporation by this Act which is in excess of 75 per centum of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952 contemplated would be employed by the Department of Agriculture or by such corporation, respectively, during such fiscal year in the performance of—

"(1) functions performed by a person designated

1 as an information specialist, information and editorial
2 specialist, publications and information coordinator, press
3 relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert,
4 television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity
5 expert, or designated by any similar title, or

6 "(2) functions performed by persons who assist
7 persons performing the functions described in (1) in
8 drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or dis-
9 seminating public information publications or releases,
10 radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photo-
11 graphs, motion pictures, and similar material,

12 shall be available to pay the compensation of persons per-
13 forming the functions described in (1) or (2)."

14 On page 65, line 4, strike out "411" and insert in lieu
15 thereof "412".

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. BYRD (for himself and Mr. FERGUSON) to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

JULY 25 (legislative day, JULY 24), 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 25 (legislative day, JULY 24), 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. DOUGLAS to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 54, line 24, strike out "497" and insert in lieu thereof "350".

7-25-51——B

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. DOUGLAS to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

JULY 25 (legislative day, JULY 24), 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 25 (legislative day, JULY 24), 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. DOUGLAS to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 51, line 19, strike out "$16,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$15,500,000".

7-25-51——C

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. DOUGLAS to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

JULY 25 (legislative day, JULY 24), 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 25 (legislative day, JULY 24), 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. DOUGLAS to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 41, line 12, strike out "$110,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$103,000,000".

7-25-51——D

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. DOUGLAS to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

JULY 25 (legislative day, JULY 24), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 25 (legislative day, JULY 24), 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. DOUGLAS to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 39, lines 10 and 11, strike out "$100,000,000; and rural telephone program, $9,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$25,000,000".

7-25-51——E

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. DOUGLAS to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

JULY 25 (legislative day, JULY 24), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 25 (legislative day, JULY 24), 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. DOUGLAS to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 35, lines 20 and 21, strike out "$12,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,000,000".

7-25-51——F

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. DOUGLAS to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

JULY 25 (legislative day, JULY 24), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 25 (legislative day, JULY 24), 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. DOUGLAS to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 31, line 15, strike out "$280,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$259,250,000".

7-25-51——G

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. DOUGLAS to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

JULY 25 (legislative day, JULY 24), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 25 (legislative day, JULY 24), 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. KEM (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. ECTON, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. WHERRY) to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 11, line 7, beginning with the colon, strike out all down to and including the word "year" in line 11.

7-25-51——H

Calendar No. 532

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. KEM (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. ECTON, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. WHERRY) to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

JULY 25 (legislative day, JULY 24), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued July 26, 1951
For actions of July 25, 1951
82nd-1st, No. 136

CONTENTS

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate debated agricultural appropriation bill, rejecting amendments to cut SCS and ACP. House recommitted conference report on independent offices appropriation bill. House debated State-Justice-Commerce appropriation bill. Senate committees reported weed-control and legislative-budget bills. Senators discussed beef-slaughter quotas. House subcommittee approved 7 flood-control survey resolutions for USDA.

SENATE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952. Continued debate on this bill, H. R. 3973 (pp. 9058-80, 9082-105). Rejected the following amendments:
   By Sen. Dirksen, to reduce SCS from $53,474,991 to $40,600,000 (p. 9058).
   By Sen. Dirksen (36-41), to reduce the advance authorization for the 1952 ACP payments to $150,000,000 (pp. 9058-80, 9082-100).
   By Sen. Ferguson (37-38), to reduce the advance ACP authorization to $200,000,000 (pp. 9100-5).
   It was agreed that debate hereafter will be limited to 30 minutes on each amendment and 1 hour on the bill, equally divided (pp. 9095-6). Sen. Wherry questioned ECA appropriations and inserted various financial tables on this subject (pp. 9083-95). Several Senators submitted amendments which they intend to propose (p. 9055). Pending at recess was a request by Sen. Ferguson for the yeas and nays on the committee amendment to increase the advance ACP authorization to $280,000,000 (House figure is $225,000,000)(p. 9105).

2. WEED CONTROL. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendments S. 1041, to provide for eradication and control of poisonous weeds, especially Halogeton glomeratus, on range and pasture lands in the several States and Territories (S. Rept. 578)(p. 9053).

3. BUDGETING. The Expenditures in the Executive Departments Committee reported with amendment S. 913, "to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies" (S. Rept. 576)(p. 9053).

4. D. C. APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952. The Appropriations Committee reported this bill, H. R. 4329, with amendments (S. Rept. 579)(p. 9053).

5. BEEF-PRICE CONTROLS. Sens. Moody and Wherry debated whether slaughtering quotas are needed to enforce price controls on beef (pp. 9097-8).

6. ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY. Sen. Wiley spoke in favor of this proposed project (pp. 9080-2).

7. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. The "Daily Digest" states that the conferees on S. 1717, the defense-production bill, "reached agreements on all differences between the House- and Senate-passed versions of title I, on allocations and priorities; title II, requisitioning and condemnation powers; title III, expansion of productive capacity; title V, settlement of labor disputes; and title VII, miscellaneous provisions (except in the case of amendments on natural gas, jurisdiction of Federal Courts, and Small Defense Plants, which provisions were put over until tomorrow. Title IV, price and wage control; and title VI, credit controls, were passed over until tomorrow. Termination dates of the various sections were also temporarily passed over." (p. D677.)

HOUSE

8. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952. Considered the conference report on this bill, H. R. 3880, recommitting the bill to the conference committee, by a vote of 188-186, with instructions to further insist on disagreement to the Senate amendments (pp. 9009-19).

9. STATE-JUSTICE-COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952. Continued debate on this bill, H. R. 4740, adopting amendments making various reductions in appropriations (pp. 9019-47).

Rep. Battle, Ala., offered an amendment to increase by $997,861 the item for contributions to International Organizations, but this amendment was modified by an amendment by Rep. Davis, Ga., to reduce these funds by $2,300,000, and adopted by a vote of 127 to 102 (pp. 9022-6).

An amendment by Rep. Williams, Miss., to provide that in no case shall the U. S. contribution to any international organization exceed one-third of the total annual cost, was ruled out of order (pp. 9026-7).

10. REORGANIZATION. Pursuant to the request of the Senate, S. 1146, to establish a temporary commission on intergovernmental relations, and S. 1166, to study administration of overseas activities, were taken from the Expenditures in Executive Departments Committee and returned to the Senate (p. 9009).

11. FLOOD CONTROL. The Flood Control Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee approved for reporting to the full committee seven resolutions authorizing the Department of Agriculture to make review studies in various watersheds in Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, and Nebraska (p. D677).

12. APPROPRIATIONS; RUBBER. Received from the President a 1952 supplemental appropriation estimate of $2,307,000 for this Department for the guayule rubber program (H. Doc. 205) (p. 9050).

13. LEGAL PROCEDURES. Passed as reported S. J. Res. 82, providing for the postponement to April 1, 1952, of the effective date of amendments to Rules of Procedure for the U. S. District Courts in the condemnation of property (pp. 9007-9). The effect of the measure is to retain the status quo for these condemnation proceedings until April 1, 1952, and if no new legislation has been enacted by that time, the changed procedure would take effect, which would permit a Federal court, in its discretion, to have the issue of compensation in

TABLE 4.—*Comparison of individual income tax liability under the Federal Revenue Acts of 1913–51 (pending)*

Revenue Act—	Income year	Married person, 2 dependents—selected amounts of income														
		$800	$1,000	$1,500	$2,000	$3,000	$5,000	$8,000	$10,000	$15,000	$20,000	$25,000	$50,000	$100,000	$500,000	$1,000,000
1913	Mar. 1, 1913, to Dec. 31, 1915						10	40	60	110	160	260	760	2,510	25,010	60,010
1916	1916						20	80	120	220	320	470	1,320	3,920	42,920	102,920
1917	1917					12	64	219	339	714	1,164	1,764	5,164	16,164	192,664	475,164
1918	1918					36	156	482	782	1,622	2,582	3,672	10,982	34,982	322,982	702,982
	1919–20					24	104	338	558	1,198	1,958	2,848	9,158	31,158	303,158	663,158
1921	1921						68	266	526	1,166	1,886	2,816	9,126	31,126	303,126	663,126
	1922						68	276	456	996	1,656	2,496	8,576	30,076	260,576	550,576
	1923						51	207	342	747	1,242	1,872	6,432	22,557	195,432	412,932
1924	1924						26	81	141	475	935	1,525	6,055	22,535	199,535	429,535
1926	1925–27						8	42	83	281	589	1,129	4,849	16,029	116,029	241,029
1928	1928, 1930–31						8	42	83	281	589	994	4,559	15,739	115,739	240,739
	1929						3	14	40	201	471	838	4,166	14,846	110,846	230,846
1932	1932–33						68	236	416	956	1,616	2,456	8,536	30,036	263,536	571,036
1934	1934–35						48	184	343	831	1,469	2,327	8,621	30,162	263,464	570,898
1936, 1938	1936–39						48	184	343	831	1,469	2,327	8,621	31,997	303,568	678,436
1940	1940 [1]						75	246	440	1,118	2,143	3,571	13,741	42,948	329,637	717,036
1941	1941					58	271	717	1,117	2,475	4,287	6,480	19,967	52,160	344,476	731,930
1942	1942 [2]				13	191	592	1,322	1,914	3,758	6,088	8,814	24,845	63,479	413,384	853,384
	1943 [2 3]	7	14	20	58	267	730	1,553	2,208	4,207	6,693	9,574	26,392	67,803	439,931	898,800
1944 [4]	1944–45	9	15	30	45	275	755	1,585	2,245	4,265	6,785	9,705	26,865	68,565	442,985	900,000
1945	1946–47					190	589	1,292	1,862	3,639	5,890	8,522	24,111	62,301	406,600	838,850
1948	1948–49					100	432	974	1,361	2,512	3,888	5,476	16,578	45,643	358,677	769,314
1950	1950					104	452	1,016	1,417	2,607	4,030	5,672	17,152	47,208	369,645	791,430
	1951					120	520	1,152	1,592	2,900	4,464	6,268	18,884	51,912	402,456	857,456
1951	Treasury proposal					144	624	1,376	1,896	3,404	5,168	7,172	20,788	55,816	422,360	897,360
	As passed House					135	585	1,296	1,791	3,263	5,022	7,052	21,245	58,401	432,027	900,000

[1] Includes defense tax.
[2] Tax liabilities for the years 1942 and 1943 are unadjusted for transition to current payment basis.
[3] Includes net victory tax computed by assuming that deductions are 10 percent of victory tax net income; i. e., that victory tax net income is ten-ninths of selected net income.
[4] Individual Income Tax Act of 1944.

Source: Most of the data 1913–45 are from the Treasury Bulletin February 1947, as supplemented by the reports of the Ways and Means Committee and Senate Finance Committee, 1946–51.

This tax schedule points off the situation faced by the professional man. A lifetime of labor is reflected in earnings of a few peak years, and these earnings are taxed at ever steeper rates. As a result, savings for old-age retirement is difficult, if not impossible. The effect of taxes on savings is shown by table 5. Savings held by all families—regardless of income level—have steadily declined. The tax rise from 1947 to 1951, alone, resulted in a decline of average savings from $470 to $300.

TABLE 5.—*Size of liquid asset holdings of spending units* [1]

[Percentage distribution of spending units]

Size of holding [2]	1951	1950	1949	1948	1947
Zero	28	31	29	27	24
$1 to $199	16	16	16	15	14
$200 to $499	14	11	13	13	12
$500 to $999	11	10	11	12	14
$1,000 to $1,999	12	10	11	12	14
$2,000 to $4,999	11	13	12	12	14
$5,000 to $9,999	5	6	5	5	5
$10,000 and over	3	3	3	4	3
All cases	100	100	100	100	100
Median holding, all units	$300	$250	$300	$350	$470
Median holding, units with assets	$710	$810	$790	$820	$890

[1] Liquid asset groupings refer to holdings at time of interviews in January, February, and early March of year indicated.
[2] Includes all types of U. S. Government bonds, checking accounts, savings accounts in banks, postal savings, and shares in savings and loan associations and credit unions. Excludes currency. Data for 1949 do not include shares in credit unions, which are relatively small in aggregate amount and not likely to affect totals significantly.

THE PLIGHT OF THE FARMER

The same problem confronts the farmers of America. Without either social security or private-pension coverage, old-age retirement is virtually impossible. According to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, only 6.7 percent of farm families receive pensions, social-security payments, or similar benefits. Crop income is subject to the vagaries of wind and weather. Cash savings are difficult to accumulate. This problem is detailed in table No. 6. In 1949, for example, 42 percent of farm families spent more than they earned.

TABLE 6.—*Savings trends of farm operators, 1946–49, percentage distribution*

Year	All spending units headed by a farm operator	Positive savers [1]	Zero savers	Negative savers [2]
1949	100	55	3	42
1948	100	61	9	30
1947	100	67	11	22
1946	100	68	13	19

[1] Spending units with money incomes in excess of expenditures.
[2] Spending units with expenditures in excess of money incomes.

Source: Board of Governors of Federal Reserve System.

This amendment removes a current inequity. Saving for retirement would be made possible for the bulk of our professional people and farmers. The self-employed should be put on an equal footing with the rest of our working population.

Security in old age has been a much-lauded policy of this Congress. Providing the means for establishment of a pension system covering over 5,000,000 people is a step toward our goal.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

Broadcast by him to the people of Pennsylvania on June 4 and July 2, 1951, constituting program Nos. 42 and 44 in the series "Happenings in Washington."

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Statement prepared by him regarding the effect of manufacturers' roll-backs.

By Mr. BYRD:

Article entitled "Government: Plan Thyself," by Henry Hazlitt, relating to the budget for 1951, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

Article entitled "Educators Should Be Warned by the Pasadena Revolt," written by Frank Chodorov, and published in the Saturday Evening Post of July 14, 1951.

By Mr. LANGER:

Article entitled "Agrarian Reform," published in the Winnipeg Free Press of June 14, 1951.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Article entitled "Shameful Chapter in History," written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Star of July 10, 1951, and an editorial entitled "Do They Mean It?" published in the Chattanooga Times of June 30, 1951, both dealing with the war in Korea, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

Editorial entitled "Not in Tune With the People," published in the Chattanooga Times of June 30, 1951, referring to the Jefferson-Jackson Day speech by Senator BYRD in Atlanta, Ga.

By Mr. BENTON:

Article entitled "United States Trade Policy Confuses Europe," written by Michael L. Hoffman and published in the New York Times, regarding United States attitude toward trade with Communist countries.

By Mr. WILEY:

Editorials from the Madison (Wis.) Times of July 11, 1951, and from the Superior (Wis.) Evening Telegram of July 14, 1951, paying tribute to Miss Katharine Lenroot, former Director of the United States Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor.

MOB VIOLENCE IN CICERO, ILL.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to address the Senate for about 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago there took place in the midwestern section of our country an incident which was reported throughout the Nation and, I fear, throughout the world. I refer to the incident in Cicero, Ill., where mob violence was invoked against a fine young man and his family, a veteran of World War II, and an upstanding citizen whose only offense was that he—a Negro—desired to move into an apartment which

was 2 miles rather than 24 miles from his place of work.

At the same time that a rowdy mob was stoning this apartment house and burning this man's furniture in Cicero, Ill., showing all the unlovely marks of hate and prejudice, a great flood was gathering and spreading devastation elsewhere in the Midwest. The heart of the Nation was moved by the tragedy of the flood. The heart of the Nation must be moved in quite another way by the tragedy of Cicero.

The area in which this incident took place is not in my State. Yet it was in a region of this country—the North—which usually, but not always justifiably, considers itself advanced in the matter of civil rights for all. The incident in Cicero highlights the fact that the ugly blight of prejudice is not the peculiar property of any region of this country, but is found, lamentably, north of the Mason and Dixon's line as well as south. Analagous incidents have happened in the past in my own State. It does not matter wherever it happens. It is a blight on the fair name of America. It is a tragic contradiction of the great principle on which our Nation was founded 175 years ago—the equality of all men before the law and the equality of all men in their enjoyment of the basic human rights.

Violence, discrimination, and racial hatred are utterly evil and destructive of democratic principles whether they occur in the North, in the East, the West, or in the South.

Race hatred and violence cannot be explained away or justified. They come as a shock to the people of other lands to whom we have proudly boasted that our country is a land of freedom, equality, and justice under law.

These inexcusable outbreaks of mob violence and mob hatred give irrefutable arguments to our enemies who are always alert in their efforts to belittle our ideals and to tear down the trust which other free people have in the United States. I am convinced that what happened last week in Cicero greatly strengthened the cause of our enemies abroad.

I know that there are explanations of what happened in Cicero. The people of Cicero are, in general, as in other parts of the United States, good hearted, and generally law abiding. Cicero, it so happens, is a virtual melting pot of people descended from many nationalities, and immigrants from many lands. The fear and insecurity in the hearts of some of these people which gave rise to this incident can be understood, but it cannot be condoned. They themselves were victims of myth and prejudice and were whipped into a hysteria which is all too common on other fronts in these difficult days.

I am encouraged by the fact that the larger community of which the city is a part has been revolted by the incident. I trust and hope that steps will be taken not only to insure that there will be no repetition of this occurence but that we will all find in this incident a grim reminder that no area or region is safe from this sort of blight until all areas and all regions are safe—just as no man is truly free until all men are truly free.

The day must come when we can face not only the world but our own souls with the assurance that hate and prejudice based on race, creed, or color have been banished forever from our land and that equality before the law and in the enjoyment of their human rights is accorded to all Americans.

VISIT OF AN AUSTRIAN DELEGATION TO THE SENATE

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, it is peculiarly fortunate that at a time when we are discussing the appropriation bill for Agriculture we have, as visitors to the Senate, a delegation from Austria, including the Minister of Agriculture and the representatives of a number of farm organizations of that sister nation. I call attention, Mr. President, to the fact that the delegation is now sitting in the Senate gallery. May I request that the Vice President call upon them to rise to their feet so we may honor them?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is happy to invite the delegation to rise so that the Members of the Senate may identify and honor them.

The Austrian delegation in the Senate gallery rose, amid applause by Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair desires to say to our distinguished visitors that we are very happy to have them as guests of the Senate, and we hope that their sojourn in this country will be pleasant and profitable to them and to their country, as well as to ourselves.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to the committee amendment on page 29, line 9. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, line 9, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out "$53,474,991" and insert in lieu thereof "$40,600,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 29, line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Water Conservation and Utilization Projects", on page 31, line 2, after the word "expended", to strike out "$185,500" and insert "$285,500".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Production and Marketing Administration—Conservation and use of agricultural land resources," on page 31, line 15, after the word "States", to strike out "$256,500,000" and insert "$280,000,000."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am informed that the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has an amendment to the committee amendment striking out "$256,500,000" and inserting "$280,000,000" in line 15 on page 31. I ask that the committee amendment go over temporarily, until we find out whether the Senator from Michigan intends to offer an amendment. I had thought that his amendment related to the future program, but I have been told that this is one of the committee amendments to which the Senator from Michigan desired to offer an amendment.

I have before me the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. It is printed. It is amendment B, submitted on July 24. The amendment is on page 31, line 15, to strike out "$280,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$275,000,000."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, when is the Senator from Michigan to return? I understood that he was to be here today?

Mr. WHERRY. I think he will be here at 1 o'clock.

Mr. RUSSELL. We agreed to pass over certain amendments. It is true that they were not reached, but I understood that they were to be disposed of today.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that the distinguished Senator from Michigan will be here by 2 o'clock. He is with a group of Senators who have been inspecting flood conditions. He has not yet arrived in the city. I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Georgia will consent to pass over this amendment temporarily until we can get some word from the office of the Senator from Michigan. I am quite sure he will be present later.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I always like to be agreeable and extend every courtesy that can be extended consistent with expeditious consideration of the bill. I will let the amendment go over temporarily.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Georgia. He is always fair. I am satisfied that there will be sufficient debate on the next amendment so that possibly by the time that is concluded the distinguished Senator from Michigan will be here anyway.

Mr. RUSSELL. For very obvious reasons I should have preferred to consider this amendment first, but I do not object to its being passed over temporarily.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over temporarily.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The amendment was, on page 33, line 1, after the word "to", to strike out "$225,000,000" and insert "$280,000,000."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and myself, I offer the amendment lettered "G," to the committee on page 33, line 1.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 33, line 1, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out "$280,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$150,000,000."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I believe the Members of the Senate are generally familiar with the import of this amendment. To make certain that there is no misunderstanding, it should be remembered that several amendments were offered. One amendment would have stricken out the $280,000,000 item, as it appears on page 31, line 15, of the bill.

I believe the chairman of the subcommittee will bear me out when I say that the $280,000,000 item relates to commitments which have already been made and to the liquidation of those commitments, which I believe Congress has always regarded as a kind of moral obligation, since the authorization was enacted in prior years.

The item which appears on page 33 relates to money which will be made available, and is in the nature of an authorization for the program which is to come. Therefore the item of $280,000,000, which I propose to reduce to $150,000,000, will in no way affect the conservation program for the 1951 crop.

I am frank to say that it would not save any money in the fiscal year 1952. I believe the chairman of the subcommittee will bear me out when I say that the only saving will come in the year 1953.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The amount which might be saved, if it could be called a saving, would not be reflected in the figures for 1952 even though the greater amount of the money would in fact be expended in 1952. Under the practice the figures are always carried over until the following fiscal year.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct. I recall in other days, when we undertook to make a reduction in this item, and again with modesty I allude to my prior experience on the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Illinois need not be modest in any statement he wishes to make with respect to that item. I am glad to state, if the Senator considers it to be a source of any credit, that I do not believe any other Member of the House of Representatives could have induced that body to absolutely eliminate the soil-conservation program. The distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] persuaded them to do just that in 1947.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to my esteemed friend from Georgia that I accept his encomiums with the utmost modesty and humility. What I am doing is being done according to my lights. I have a deep conviction with respect to this matter, and I have followed what I believe to be a consistent program, which goes back over more than a decade.

Therefore, as I come to this item, I want to say, first, that the adoption of my amendment would not hurt farmers particularly. Some 3,100,000 farmers are participating in the program. If I am correctly advised, the average payment would be about $85. Of course, that is an amount which can be sacrificed by the farmers, and it is an amount which the farmers would sacrifice in the interest of the common good. I am not insensible to the fact that the payment program provides a ceiling of $2,500. However, the figures which I had before me indicated that the average payment would have been about $85. Those are the payments which would go to the cooperators.

Mr. President, if we do not make the cut now, it cannot be done later, because this is the authorizing language in the bill. It would be only fair to do it at this time.

Secondly, it is fair to the Federal Treasury, at a time when we have pending revenue legislation imposing additional tax burdens which are greater than any the country has ever known, and when there is necessity for genuine economy.

I cite in support of the amendment none other than the President of the American Farm Bureau Federation, who, in behalf of his organization, which numbers millions of farm families, supports the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is usually very accurate in his statements. However, his present amendment does not embrace the proposal of the Federal Farm Bureau Federation, although the figure does. The Federal Farm Bureau Federation, through its Board of Directors, recommended that the figure be $150,000,000. However, they specifically recommended that the money be disbursed on the basis of need. They said they thought that was the only basis on which a reduction could be justified. The Senator's amendment does not change the formula, and it does not include the important part of the recommendation made by the Federal Farm Bureau Federation, namely, that the money be disbursed on the basis of need.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Such a proposal would be legislative in character.

Mr. RUSSELL. All of this section is legislation. The Senator could cover it in his amendment, if he desired to do so. He could add such a provision to his amendment, if he desired to do so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me submit a portion of the statement of Mr. Kline, presented not only to the House committee, but I believe also to the Senate committee. He said:

> As an indication of the earnestness with which we approach the problem of reducing Government expenditures, we are recommending that the authorization for the 1952 agricultural conservation program be reduced from the budget recommendation of $285,000,000 to $150,000,000. Because of the advanced stages of development of the 1951 program, we do not feel that the commitments made should be interfered with. We call attention to the fact that our recommendation to the Congress in 1951 was for a $250,000,000 program as against the $285,000,000 appropriated.

They supported at least a modest cut of about $35,000,000 in the 1951 program.

The reduction to be effected by my amendment does not go a bit deeper than the reduction proposed by this great farm organization, but it is $130,000,000 below the committee recommendation, and $75,000,000 below the House figure. Mr. Kline made it clear in his testimony that not every member of the Farm Bureau approved the Federation's recommendation of $150,000,000. Mr. Kline said he thought there were many members who believed the program could be cut out entirely. I rather fancy that if we could poll the American farmers today, in the light of conditions which obtain, and in the light of the attention which we are giving to our national security, we would find a large element among American farmers who would be willing to dispense with the program entirely, if they thought it was conducive to our security. Other members of the organization thought the budget amount should be recommended.

The Federation recommendation was a compromise. Two members did appear before the subcommittee to say they disagreed with the Federation's recommendations, and asked for a greater appropriation. Their views certainly should not outweigh the position taken by the organization as a whole.

A representative of the National Agricultural Limestone Association came before the committee, armed with postcard replies from farmers to a questionnaire, based on a self-serving letter, indicating a demand for a larger program. I wish to allude to that item for a moment.

As everyone knows, the conservation payments are made when the farmer completes certain soil conserving services. It may be terracing of the land, growing fruit trees, contour plowing, or the application of limestone.

One of the most militant and vigorous organizations in behalf of the maintenance of a high level of conservation payments was the limestone organization. Their operations are nothing new in Washington. I remember years ago when a young man by the name of Robert M. Koch, who was then employed by the Department of Agriculture, was engaged by the limestone producers of the country. He established an office downtown and equipped himself with a number of secretarial aids and some mimeograph machines, and then began to send postcards and mimeographed circular letters all over the country.

He had a rather artful way of asking the farmers whether they approved of the Federal Farm Bureau Federation's program, or whether they wanted to see the program cut. I fancy I could do about the same kind of job and elicit about the same kind of replies. I certainly was regaled by the testimony of Mr. Koch, which appears at page 719 of the Senate hearings. It is the same old story and the same old dodge which have been in evidence for a long time. It is a kind of pressure which is exerted upon the American farmers to induce them to insist that their Senators and Representatives continue the payments at a high level. On the other hand, a very responsible farm organization, the

largest in the country, feels that in the interest of economy there ought to be a substantial cut made, from $280,000,000 to $150,000,000.

I have said over and over again on the floor of the Senate that if we are going to have austerity, then austerity, like charity, should begin at home, and it should begin in government. Spending is the No. 1 inflationary force.

So it seems to me that my amendment to the committee amendment, which would save a very substantial amount of money, and which comes well endorsed by the largest farm organization in the country, should commend itself to the thinking and the favor of the Senate. I do not believe it requires any more belaboring on my part, for over the years this matter has been belabored and beset enough, and I think every Member of the Senate is familiar with the equities here involved.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I notice that the Senator has said that the average payment to the farmers would be $85.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, for the entire country.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Illinois has spoken of his amendment to the committee amendment in terms of dollars and cents. Does he not think that this is a matter of a program of soil conservation, rather than a matter of paying out money to the farmers; and is not the Senator concerned with the idea that if we unduly curtail the program and its highly beneficial results, there will be a great loss; and in future years a failure to continue the program will soon put us back where we formerly were in the case of soil-conservation work, namely, having it done on a regional basis?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would it not seem strange that if there were some conviction that the cut I propose would impair the program, the largest farm organization in the Nation would favor it?

Mr. STENNIS. The sentiment on that issue in the farm organization referred to was far from unanimous. Moreover, sometimes people would rather be consistent than right. I think this was one time when the Farm Bureau Federation was attempting to be consistent with its program of economy, and it struck at the wrong place.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the position of the American Farm Bureau Federation on this matter is a testimonial, first, to the unselfishness of the American farmer and, second, to his patriotism and his desire to make sacrifices along with the sacrifices made by every other segment of the population of the Nation.

Mr. STENNIS. I agree with the Senator that this is not a matter of trying to get something for the farmer. The farmer holds the land in trust for future generations, as I see it; and I think this is a Government program which works with him while he is the custodian of the land for his generation, in preserving it for the future.

If the Senator from Illinois will permit, I should like to say that I have just returned from a hurried trip to the Kansas City area, where there have occurred the terrific floods not only on the main rivers, but also on the tributaries, and great loss of property, including homes and terrific physical destruction, both industrial and rural. However, the outstanding loss, to my mind, is the loss of the soil. After all, homes can be replaced and industrial plants can be rebuilt; but the soil which has been lost in floods is gone forever. The top soil was removed from thousands and thousands of acres of land.

That situation emphasizes, to my mind, the necessity for taking the long-range view in connection with this matter, which relates to the continuity of the soil-conservation program and the importance of the construction of dams.

We saw the present situation in that area very vividly from the air. In the portion of one of those river valleys which is protected by a dam, the crops are growing and everything is in order; but immediately below the dam and the protected area, everything is destroyed, for a width of from 1 to 2 miles, and for a distance along the stream, not of 1 or 2 miles, but of hundreds of miles.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In reply, having had some experience as a drainage contractor years ago, I can say to my good friend, the Senator from Mississippi, that all the limestone and all the plant food which might be put into the soil would be wasted in the face of the kind of precipitation and the kind of runoff which occurred in the area to which he has referred, and of course it would not have any effect on this program.

I fully share the Senator's desire to preserve the soil. However, again there are the other considerations.

If it was not the intention of the Government when these programs were initiated in the first place, I think it should have been to do the work first where it was worst needed, and then move on to other areas. But we should place in the mind of the farmer a proprietary interest and a realization that he also has a responsibility for conservation of the soil. If he holds a fee-simple title to 160 acres of land upon the surface of the earth, he also has a responsibility, over and above that of the Federal Government and of the State. Certainly I do not believe it was ever intended that we should take any individual by the hand and constantly and forever lead him. The idea was to suggest to him that he had a responsibility for soil conservation; and, having helped him rather generously over a period of years, then he should assume the major obligation.

Mr. STENNIS. I agree entirely with the last statement the Senator from Illinois has made, and I appreciate his courtesy in yielding to me.

Let me suggest that rather than make the lump-sum reduction suggested by the Senator's amendment to the committee amendment, it seems to me that this matter calls for an examination of the program. If it is not working or if it is not being administered correctly or if it is being abused either by the administration or by the landowner, there is the place to effect the remedy, rather than to make a lump-sum reduction in the appropriation, as would be done by the amendment of the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the answer to the Senator's statement is, of course, that in dealing with an appropriation bill, we are dealing—as always is the case—with the authorization language for a program which becomes effective in the days which lie ahead. The Senator may notice from the language of the bill that it deals with the formulation of the program. If we do not deal with it at this stage, the commitments will be made; and then it will be hard to resist the moral argument that is always advanced in such cases, namely, that the commitment has been made, in effect, and that we should not go back on the farmers.

So this is the time to make the change, and we have a large farm organization and its leadership behind this proposal.

Of course, obviously, there is not unanimity of sentiment in any organization. However, at least a major part of this organization, representing farmers in every State of the Union, has spoken in favor of this proposal and stand solidly behind it. They have come out into the open, and they have made the request, and they have stated where they stood. I believe that representations have been made to every Member of the House and every Member of the Senate in behalf of the curtailment of this appropriation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wonder whether the Senator from Illinois will permit me to read briefly from the hearings which were held on Wednesday, July 18, when Mr. Newsom, master of the Grange, testified before our committee on this same subject.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. At that time Mr. Newsom was being asked if he did not agree that this phase of the agricultural program was a depression measure, and one which was intended to be suspended at the end of the depression.

Here is his answer:

> I personally believe there is no justification for that sort of thing—payment to individual farmers under present income positions.

I think that speaks well for the Master of the Grange.

The Senator from Illinois has already quoted the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, who advocates this $130,000,000 reduction in the appropriation.

Practically the only attempts to justify the larger expenditures come from the office holders in the Government bureau in Washington. They hate to see appropriations for their agency cut down. They are afraid some of them will lose their soft jobs.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the Senator from Illinois have any data or information as to the number of personnel involved in this particular appropriation for soil conservation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I call the attention of my friend, the Senator from Idaho, to the fact that this is only one of the components of the Production and Marketing Administration, which of course includes not only this item, but also all the field services which go along with it, and includes the Sugar Act program, the Agricultural Act program, the school-lunch program, and all the marketing services. The personnel are lumped together. So it has been impossible for me, within the time available to me, to make an apportionment and to tell how many employees are assigned to each one of the component programs.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the Senator from Illinois know whether the Ferguson amendment has already been applied to this appropriation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Ferguson amendment has already been applied to the items on page 31 and to the program for 1951. However, my amendment to the committee amendment deals with the program and the authorizing legislation to become effective in 1952 and 1953.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say about the matter, and at the moment I yield the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this amendment involves an issue which has been before the Senate time and time again. It involves a very simple proposition, as I see it, namely, whether the people of the United States as a whole have such a direct and vital stake in preserving the fertility of the soil on the farms of the Nation that they will adopt conservation measures which will prevent the siltation of stream and reservoirs, and assure the generations which will come after the last one of us has passed from the scene that they will have land from which they may secure food for their sustenance, and fiber that they may be clothed.

I wish at the very outset to make it perfectly clear to the Senate that the amendment in the form proposed by the Senator from Illinois is not the amendment suggested by the Farm Bureau Federation; nor was it presented to the committee by any witness. The Senator from Illinois has very carefully dissociated from his amendment one of the most important suggestions made by the Farm Bureau Federation. Representatives of the Farm Bureau Federation—though, of course, I contend that they do not speak for the majority of the farmers who are the members of that association, in making this suggestion—appeared before the committee and suggested that this authorization for next year be reduced to $150,000,000, and that this fund be apportioned on the basis of need.

Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. WILLIAMS addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, the Senate can approve the reduction, but, as my friend from Georgia has indicated, an amendment apportioning the fund on the basis of need would be legislative in character.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Unless I misunderstood him, he indicated a moment ago that it would be legislative in character.

Mr. RUSSELL. It would be, but the Senator knows that this whole section is legislation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. And, of course, if the Senator from Illinois wishes to amend his amendment to include the language "to be apportioned on the basis of need," he is entirely within the rules of the Senate, and no point of order will be made by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is a suggestion which the Senator from Illinois wants to make, that, if the Senate decides that this authorization can be cut, an amendment to insert the words "to be apportioned on the basis of need" can then be submitted.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, but the Senator has very carefully divided it, and he has not brought forward the entire suggestion of the Farm Bureau Federation, as he is permitted to do under the rules of the Senate. I am opposed to the amendment, however he may dress it up.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. But the Senator has reiterated, time and time again, that this was a Farm Bureau Federation amendment, but every shred of evidence in the record bears out that it does not conform to the recommendations of the Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The junior Senator from Illinois wants to say now that, if the Senate approves the cut proposed by me in this authorization, then the next amendment I shall offer will be to insert the words "to be apportioned on the basis of need".

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know whether or not such an amendment would then be in order; but I am so sustained by the faith that the Senate will never destroy this important work by approving the Senator's amendment, that I shall not labor that particular question any longer. I now yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Illinois whether the bill does not already provide that whatever amount is appropriated shall be distributed on the basis of need? I read from page 33 of the bill: "and formulated on the basis of a distribution of the funds available for payments and grants among the several States in accordance with their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary."

That is exactly what the Senator from Georgia is advocating.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no. Unfortunately, the Senator from Delaware, following in the footsteps of the Senator from Illinois, only read half the provision. Had he continued by reading the very next words, which are "except that the proportion allocated to any State shall not be reduced more than 15 percent from the distribution for the next preceding program year."

He would have shown that there was a limitation in the bill which prevented any distribution solely on the basis of need, as suggested by the Farm Bureau Federation witness.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, is it that limitation which the Senator from Georgia wants to strike out? I do not think that this provision would restrict the operation as he says, but if that is the only objection we can amend the amendment and gain his support.

Mr. RUSSELL. If that is stricken out, it would make the amendment conform to what was suggested by Mr. Kline, of the American Farm Bureau Federation. The provision I have read does not conform to his suggestion.

I happen to be reasonably familiar with the history of this provision. It was inserted in the bill on my motion in 1947, when the House committee deleted all funds whatever for soil conservation, and when some of us in the Senate were trying desperately to effect certain restorations. I offered an amendment, that the sum be apportioned on the basis of the need The distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], apprehending that there might be some severe reductions in certain States, then offered the 15-percent-limitation amendment. That is the history of this language, which has been carried over from year to year, from 1947, and which is found in the pending bill.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Without that so-called 15-percent amendment, under the basis-of-need formula, some States would have lost approximately half of their funds. Others in agricultural areas which were very similar would have gained in like amounts. My own State of North Dakota would have lost half of its entire funds and the State of South Dakota, a very similar State, would not have lost any.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is why I was pointing out the fact that the Senator from Illinois had carefully refrained from adding a pure basis-of-need distribution. As I recall, his State of Illinois would be one of those which would have been very drastically reduced, if the Senator from North Dakota had not included the 15-percent limitation.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this program has been in effect for a great many years. I would that all the Members of the Senate could have at least 1 week's time, in order that they might travel to various areas where the program has been in effect, to see the almost monumental accomplishment in saving vital, fertile soils which were eroding at the staggering rate of millions of acres of land each year, at the time the program was instituted in 1935.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I desire to make a brief statement, with the indulgence of the Senator from Georgia. I have heard repeatedly that representatives from the southern portion of the United States are not progressive. I have been a member of the Appropriations Committee for quite a number of years, and I worked with the Senator from Georgia on the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture. Let me tell the Senate now that if there is any progressive legislation which means something to the future of the United States, it is legislation which will protect our natural resources, and I venture to say that there is no one who has worked harder to protect the interests and resources of the United States than has the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Senate Appropriations Committee. I have seen him in action, and I hope he will continue his good work in that direction.

Progressiveness does not consist of lip service. It consists of action; and if there is any one particular bill which really carries out the idea of progressive legislation it is the agricultural appropriation bill.

I merely wanted to make this statement in order to refute the idea that southern Senators, or southern Representatives, or other official representatives from the South, are not progressive.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I feel very humble in the presence of such a tribute as that just uttered by my distinguished friend from New Mexico. I thank him from the bottom of my heart.

With some of my friends, I have a conviction, rising almost to an obsession, that if this Nation of ours is to endure, as we hope it will endure, for century upon century, it is essential that the Federal Government give some general direction to a program which will prevent our going the way of other great civilizations which have arisen, and have fallen because they did not protect their natural resources, and could not sustain their increasing populations.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. I wish to join the Senator from Georgia in opposition to this amendment, which would reduce the appropriation to $150,000,000. In my opinion, rather than reducing it to $150,000,000, it would be better if we cut the amount to $5,000,000 or $10,000,000, and simply preserve, by that amount, the county committee system. This program would then be used only for the purpose of supporting farm prices. A fund of $150,000,000 would be of such little use, and the cut proposed would go so far toward destroying the whole program, that I think we would be better off, as I have suggested, if we cut the over-all amount to, say, $5,000,000 or $10,000,000.

It would take somewhere near the amount contained in this bill adequately to carry on the program which is so vitally needed to preserve our soil fertility in the defense build-up period when we have a tendency to unduly deplete our soil by ever-increased demand for more production.

Mr. President, I should like to point out some of the practices which have been carried out under the program in the past year. For example, 83,964 miles of standard terraces have been constructed; diversion terraces and ditches, 2,262 miles; green manure and cover crops to prevent erosion and to improve the soil, 17,590,658 acres; earthen dams for erosion control, of the storage type, irrigation and stock water, 99,368 dams; seeding pasture and range land, 5,035,975 acres; sod waterways, 54,800 acres; open and enclosed drains, 45,260 miles.

These, I believe, are most valuable practices which the farmers themselves, without this program, would never have carried out. In this ag , when we are losing close to a million acres a year by erosion of various types in the United States and when there is a world-wide shortage of food, I just cannot see the logic in curtailing this important program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the entire list of selected practices carried out under the 1949 agricultural conservation program.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Extent of selected practices carried out under the 1949 agricultural conservation program

Standard terraces ..... miles	83,964
Diversion terraces and ditches miles	2,262
Green manure and cover crops to prevent erosion and improve the soil ..... acres	17,590,658
Earthen dams for erosion control (storage type), irrigation, and stock water ..... dams	99,368
Seeding pasture and range land ..... acres	5,035,975
Sod waterways ..... do	54,800
Open and closed drains ..... miles	45,260
Land leveling for irrigation ..... acres	653,594
Irrigation ditches and dikes ..... miles	3,890
Trees planted for reforestration and erosion control (trees are normally planted at rate of 500 to 1,000 per acre, depending upon locality and kind of trees used) ..... acres	95,573
Contour farming (close-sown crops, intertilled corps, and stripcropping) ..... acres	6,105,000
Firebreaks and fire lanes constructed to protect woodland ..... miles	23,538

Portion of assistance given by practice groups

	Percent	Estimated assistance
Inorganic materials	42.65	$95,000,000
Protective and green manure crops	14.52	32,000,000
Erosion control and water conservation	22.89	52,000,000
Range and pasture	13.89	31,000,000
Forestry	.34	1,000,000
Miscellaneous, such as land clearing, weed control, lining reservoirs, mulching, etc	5.71	13,000,000
Total	100.00	224,000,000

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from North Dakota for his contribution.

It has been charged here that the program is only a lime and phosphate program. In Illinois that may be the only kind of program it is, but over the rest of the Nation it is much more comprehensive than the mere distribution of lime and phosphate, important as they are to the fertility of our soil and in producing the necessary agricultural commodities.

As the distinguished Senator from North Dakota has pointed out, the program in 1949 alone involved the construction of 83,964 miles of terracing, sufficient to terrace a belt around the entire earth three and a half times. On the farms of the United States we permitted the natural wealth of the soil to wash down to the seas almost unchecked, until this program was put into effect. The conservation program includes a gigantic program of planting trees. That is one of the most important parts of the program. In 1949 more than 76,000,000 trees were planted on American farms in pursuance of this program. At that rate over a period of 10 years there were planted at least 760,000,000 trees, which are growing today to replenish our depleted forests and to supply the need of wood and wood products to the American people who will come after us. Those trees, which were planted pursuant to the practices upon the eroded portions of farms, are still standing, and they control the waters that fall and prevent the further leaching of whatever fertility might remain in the soil.

We hear talk about the program being merely a phosphate and lime program. In 1 year, 1949, there were constructed, pursuant to this conservation program, 23,538 miles of firebreaks and fire lanes to protect woodlands from devastation by fire. The program touches every conceivable conservation practice. I very much regret that, apparently, the State of Illinois depends on a lime and phosphate program.

It is true the program is worked out by various State committees, and is then submitted to the Washington office of the Department of Agriculture for approval or disapproval; but over the Nation as a whole it involves every possible soil-conserving practice necessary if we are to win in the constant struggle between man and the elements. We once denuded our lands of timber and left them at the mercy of windstorms and floods, which carried away the top soil from millions of acres of land before we instituted this program.

No, Mr. President, this is not a temporary program. It is as permanent as is our desire that the American Nation shall endure, that our people shall be able to enjoy the high standard of living of which we are so proud, and which distinguishes us from the less fortunate peoples of the earth.

It has been said, "Let the farmer do it." Well, the farmer is now putting up about $3 for each Federal dollar, when we include his labor. The increased cost next year for carrying out

the same practices will make it necessary for the farmer to increase his out-of-pocket expenditures by $32,000,000. Inflation is increasing the part which the farmer must take in the program. The farmer represents 20 percent of the population of the Nation. Should he be compelled to bear alone all the cost of the burden of assuring future generations that they will have fertile fields to till? The program means just as much to the man who lives in the city as to the man who lives on the farm.

All the great advancements of science have not yet enabled a man to wean himself from eating so that he can exist. He cannot even do it with vitamins. He must have the basic foods if he is to endure.

We should not abandon or strike down the soil-conservation program, which would be the effect of the adoption of the amendment suggested by the Senator from Illinois.

I hope, Mr. President, that Senators undersand the issue. I believe they do. A man can ride through the country, in any agricultural area of the United States, I care not where he goes, north, south, east, or west, and find that soils are more fertile today than they were 30 years ago. Why is that true? Until the conservation program was instituted we were losing our richest lands at a perfectly alarming rate. The improvement has not been spectacular, not like that which followed the construction of the Grand Coulee Dam or of the Panama Canal, but it has been even more successful because we are now winning the struggle against mother nature, who seeks to take away the fertility of our soil and render us unable to sustain ourselves as a great people, all over the land.

Great progress has been made. Too much is involved to permit anyone in the name of economy to strike down the program, which has already been drastically reduced.

When the act was first passed in 1936, after the Supreme Court had stricken down the processing taxes, there was an authorization of half a million dollars a year for the work. That authorization still stands upon the books. For 7 or 8 years we appropriated the full amount, and no one ever thought of challenging it. The war came along and we reduced the amount. Then came the Eightieth Congress, which almost wrecked the program, by putting it on a greatly reduced scale. It would be the height of folly, as I see it, to destroy a program which has meant so much in time of national danger and promises so much for the future.

Mr. President, how did we get the unparalleled production from our farms in World War II? Was it just a "happenstance"? No, it was because we had for years improved the fertility of the soil, so as to be able to produce enough wheat and meat, not only for our own people but for those of our allies and the people of the earth who were starving. In reality the appropriation recommended by the committee is but a pittance for this program, in view of the fact that we are again calling upon those farmers for great contributions in food and clothing. Certainly if there ever was a time when we should step up the tempo of this program, instead of striking it down, it is now, when we are calling upon the farmers to increase production., as we are today.

Mr. President, we have heard a great deal about the position of the Farm Bureau Federation with respect to this item. I do not quarrel with Mr. Kline, or the majority of his board of directors who have seen fit to come forward and advocate that the program be reduced and put upon the basis of need. They are wholly within their rights. But I submit in all earnestness that we have had such testimony before, and that there are certain aristocrats in agriculture. There is a limitation upon the amount that can be paid. This program is essential to preserve the family-type farm. It does not help the large corporate farms to which it matters not to how great an extent they carry out, farm conserving practices even up to $100,000, for they are limited in their final payments to $2,500. Many of the large farmers, the big operators, the corporate farmers, feel that they pay as much in income taxes as they might get out of the program, and they are not enthusiastic about the program. But the program helps where the help is needed, on the family-size farm in the United States. The big corporate farmers carry out soil conservation practices, I admit, and the law takes that into contemplation when it says that the limitation upon any farm, coporation or association, in what it can receive, is $2,500 out of this appropriation.

Mr. President, there are in the record a number of telegrams which cast some light upon the question of whether the membership of the Farm Bureau Federation is altogether happy about the suggestion made by the head of that great organization. And it is a great organization. It has done a great deal for the farmer, particularly in promoting research work.

I have here a telegram from Franklin, Mass. I was rather surprised at the telegram presented to the committee by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] from a bureau in Massachusetts. It reads:

> DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: The Norfolk County Farm Bureau directors at their recent regular meeting passed a resolution to stand firm against the proposed cut in USDA appropriation. We realize this is contrary to the position of the American Farm Bureau Federation. Naturally we cannot speak for the rest of the country, but we do know that Norfolk County farmers have been treading water for some time. Now with many going under we honestly need the USDA services as they now stand. Cuts beyond the current point will leave the remaining degree of services ineffective upon our families.
>
> RICHARD C. HILL,
> *Executive Secretary, Norfolk County Farm Bureau.*

The record contains a number of letters from other States.

Of course, a poll was taken, as the Senator from Illinois mentioned. He said it was taken by some phosphate company, and therefore should be considered with a grain of salt. The witness who appeared before us produced a copy of a letter he had mailed to 100,000 farmers in New York State, and I think to an equal number in the State of Iowa. He mailed them in New York State to many members of the New York Farm Bureau Federation. The record of the hearings indicates the questions put to the farmers. They were asked to check on a post card certain points. This witness brought before the committee post cards which were piled up 4 or 5 feet high on the table, great quantities of them, thousands of them, testimony which one could see with one's own eyes. The farmers were to check these points:

> I believe the agricultural conservation program should be continued.
>
> I believe a larger ACP would result in more conservation practices being carried out.
>
> I agree with the directors of the New York State Farm Bureau that the ACP should be cut out.
>
> I am a member of the New York State Farm Bureau.

Those were the four items the farmers were to check against. They were to check as to whether they were members of the New York State Farm Bureau; as to whether they thought the agricultural conservation program should be continued; as to whether they thought it should be eliminated, or as to whether there should be a larger appropriation for the agricultural conservation payment program.

In New York State 82.5 percent of the farmers replying stated that the program should be continued; and I saw the thousands of cards with my own eyes. Sixty-six percent of the farmers said it should be increased; 17½ percent said it should be discontinued. Yet we are told that the Farm Bureau in New York State is wholeheartedly in favor of striking down this program.

Mr. President, I say it reluctantly, but it is not always true that the voice of the small operators can be heard in these halls when we come to dealing with matters of farm legislation. They are not so vocal as are some of the larger ones. When we go to the forks of the creek and get down onto the dirt roads that lead from the pavements, the small operators are much more numerous and they are much more important to the agricultural economy of the Nation, and it is my humble opinion they overwhelmingly favor this program.

In the State of Iowa the response to the survey ran in about the same ratio. The agency also polled 1,500 Farm Bureau township directors, who I understand are elected at the township level in the State of Iowa. That is the State from whence I believe the very able head of the Farm Bureau, Mr. Kline, comes. Eighty-five and one-half percent of the Farm Bureau directors of Iowa replying voted to continue the program on the same level; 58 percent said it should be increased above the figure that is proposed here by the committee; and 14.5 percent of the directors said it should be discontinued.

That a majority of the farmers of my own State favor a strong conservation program is within my own knowledge. It so happens that I live in a rural area, and I know something about the feelings of the small farmers. The small farmers, indeed, constitute the backbone of the Farm Bureau Federation in my State of Georgia and they believe in the conservation program.

Mr. President, I do not desire to discuss the matter at great length. I have done so on the floor of the Senate time and time again when similar measures were pending and similar amendments were debated. I merely wish to say that this is a question in which every citizen has a stake, and that now, when we are calling upon the farmers of the country to increase their production more than ever before, to higher levels even than those reached in World War II, today is the most inopportune period which I could possibly think of for making a reduction in these funds.

Mr. President, I admire the resourcefulness and the persuasiveness of the Senator from Illinois. I was interested yesterday afternoon when he said we ought to cut the soil conservation appropriation because the Department was working at cross purposes, and was trying to get all the corn bins filled up, and to make the farmers clean cultivate the land, and that the clean cultivation took the fertility from the soil.

I see that situation exactly contrary to the way in which the Senator from Illinois sees it. The time when we are calling upon the farmers to increase their cultivation, when we are calling upon them, in the name of patriotism and their love of country, to engage in more intensive tillage of the soil, and to take from the soil more of its fertility, is the time when the obligation of the Federal Government is greater than at any other time to support them in their conservation practices and efforts, because much fertility is being taken away at the request of the Government.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he yields the floor?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I merely wished to add, as a sort of epilogue to the very able statement of my good friend from Georgia, that I recall in other years my efforts to develop some economies. Members of the House used to walk down to the Well of the House and wave telegrams and say, "The Farm Bureau is against it." Often the junior Senator from Illinois, then a humble Representative, had to taste the bitter dose of defeat, because the farm organizations were against something.

Now comes a farm organization to support economy; and yet there is resistance to the effort. I should add that in the vote among their board of directors in July of this year the vote was 15 to 2 in behalf of a curtailment of $130,000,000 in these funds.

Mr. RUSSELL. That may well be, but I say to the Senator from Illinois that my devotion to the cause of conservation is not dependent upon the recommendations of any organization. I welcome the support of such organizations when they stand with me. I oppose them when they are against what I consider to be proper conservation practices, because I believe it is essential that we take note of the terrible depletion and losses we have sustained, and take proper steps to see that they are restored. I shall support a proper soil conservation program undeviatingly, whether in any particular year the Farm Bureau happens to be for or against the program. I hope it will be for it. If it is against it, I will still stand for the cause of conservation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to the committee amendment on page 33, line 1.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Georgia for the splendid presentation he has made of this subject. All one has to do to realize the importance of soil-conservation programs is to study the charts which he presented to the Senate yesterday. They depict a program of progress. They demonstrate what soil conservation has done for the United States.

As pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Georgia yesterday, every great civilization, every great nation, and every great people in the past has died as its agriculture has died. All one has to do is to travel over the East and he can see the effect of failure to conserve land resources. That is the thing which the distiguished Senator from Georgia has been trying to avoid in his fight for soil conservation throughout the years. He is certainly to be commended for the fight which he has made, especially in the Eightieth Congress.

Henry Ford once said, "The further we get away from the land, the greater our insecurity." At a time when we are focusing our attention on munitions, implements of war, and national defense, it is well to remember the basic truth behind this statement.

Our farms, which produce the raw materials for our finished products, and the food which sustains us, are the foundation of our economy. Let us make no mistake about that. In this national emergency, our farmers are asked to produce more and more. In our haste to achieve larger crop yields, we must not forget the need for conservation of our land. Productive land can be lost if it is not properly conserved. We learned from experience.

The agricultural-conservation program which would be affected by this amendment is one of our most effective ways of preventing the loss of land, and of increasing its productivity. Under this program the farmer is encouraged by payment of a part of the cost of the conservation practice, averaging about 50 percent, to conserve and enrich his soil. This encouragement is necessary because many farmers cannot afford to make the full investment required for the conservation practice and because many tenant farmers are not greatly concerned with the long-range condition of the land, and are concerned only with immediate short-time returns. The incentive for conservation under this program is available to every farmer in the United States.

It is estimated that 3,000,000 farmers participated in this conservation program in 1951. The conservation practices included the fertilization of the soil, erosion control, protective crops, weed control, and leveling of land. These practices have kept land in production that might otherwise have been lost, and have increased the productivity of land. It is well to remember that nearly all of our land is in cultivation. To supply our growing needs we must keep the land we have and increase its productivity.

The budget estimate for this work was $285,000,000.

The House bill appropriated $256,500,000.

The Senate Appropriation Committee recommended $280,000,000.

The proposed amendment would cut this amount to $150,000,000.

It is these purported friends of agriculture who have consistently fought the agricultural program. There is nothing new about the amendment now before us, except perhaps the name of the author. It is another in a long series of attempts during the past decade to throttle our basic industry. Each such amendment would have had the effect of curbing the progress that has been made under a comprehensive, intelligent farm policy which has made us the greatest agriculturally productive country in all the history of the world.

No farmer is going to be fooled by this fake talk about economy, about cutting soil-conservation payments, or reducing funds for scientific research, or coping with plant diseases or insect pests. He knows that is false economy; that eliminating those costs actually will result in smaller crops and higher prices. And no consumer is going to be fooled by subtle suggestions that the farmers are rich and do not need these payments and services. He knows that these are investments in producing more crops and cheaper prices.

We have just passed a control bill and it is in conference. Since the Defense Production Act was passed less than a year ago, we have seen the price of cotton go down from 45 cents a pound to 33 or 34 cents a pound. Why did it go down? Because the farmer is producing more cotton this year. The consumer must not make the mistake of thinking that prices can be reduced solely by controls. They must be met by supply and demand, and the best way to reduce prices is by production.

In 1947, in the Eightieth Congress, a strong effort was made to kill the soil-conservation-payments program as well as the school-lunch program. It was the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] who led the fight against killing those programs. At that time, this conservation program for 1948 was reduced to $150,000,000. As a result of this reduction, the number of individual conservation practices carried out de-

creased 27 percent from the preceding year. The specific damage to the conservation program after the reduction is shown by these examples:

First. Number of dams constructed to conserve water and control erosion dropped 45 percent.

Second. Improving pasture and reorganizing irrigation ditches and dikes dropped 52 percent.

If the amendment of the Senator from Illinois is adopted, it is certain that the conservation practices of farmers will be greatly reduced. This will injure all of us for it will undoubtedly mean an eventual decrease in the productivity of the soil, smaller crops, and possible loss of land for cultivating.

At a time when we are in a production race with the capacity of the Soviet Union and its sattelites, this is false economy.

Furthermore, the appropriation the Senate is now considering is to be used, in a large part, to assist farmers who have already begun their conservation practices under the existing understanding with the Government that they would receive approximately half the cost of such projects.

Farmers are not able to complete all their conservation work in 1 year, 2 years, or even 3 years. They must plan a long-range program, year after year. If we expect to assist them we must help them develop a long-range program.

If the appropriation is reduced, as proposed by the Senator from Illinois, it will be necessary to break faith with the farmers and reduce the payments made to them.

To the end that our great Nation may be more secure, I sincerely hope that the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I simply wish to add one thought to the observations of the majority leader. Much of the money goes to the large operators. They know the value of conservation. It requires no stipend from the Federal Treasury, and no subsidy, either large or small, to persuade them on that point.

In the case of other farmers, I cannot believe that the failure to pay them either $35 or $85 from the Federal Treasury will compel them to discontinue soil-conservation practices. I believe farmers know enough about it. I believe they are wedded to the idea sufficiently, so that a small hand-out will not make the difference between a continuance and a discontinuance of a program which enriches the farmer by giving him a better yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wish to say only a few words to my good friend from Illinois. As was pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, the payments are limited to $2,500. The big farmer cannot get too much benefit from $2,500. He is not so much interested in the payments. He pays a greater proportion in taxes than he receives in benefits. It is the man who operates the smaller farm who needs the assistance; and $2,500 does not go so very far in this day, even in the case of a small farmer. He may be able to fix a ditch or level the land this year, and perhaps terrace another part of the land next year. By no stretch of the imagination can these payments be construed as representing a program designed for the benefit of the operators of large farms and corporate farms.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate very long with my argument. The pending amendment raises a most vital issue from a national standpoint. Certainly I am not interested, I am glad to say to my friend, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in this program as a source of income to any farmer, be he a large landowner or a small landowner. So far as individual income to him is concerned, I do not believe it can be justified on any such basis, as a matter of principle. Rather, it goes to the long-range, over-all, and basic fertility, conservation, protection, and upbuilding of our soil, which is the ultimate source and the real source of our sustenance and of the strength of our great Nation. It is not a matter of paying a farmer $85; it is not a matter of paying a farmer anything. I certainly do not own enough land for the program to make any difference to me personally. The meager amount which may accrue to a small farmer I shall discuss in a moment from personal experience, but as a stimulus to the community, the payments are well worth while.

I live close enough to the soil to know that it is a stmulus for one farmer to improve his land, because every farmer from time to time looks over the fence at his neighbor farmer to find out what he is doing.

I am impressed by what has been said about the 15-to-2 vote of the American Farm Bureau Federation on this issue. In that vote they certainly were not representing the so-called small farmer so far as his interest in this program is concerned.

I have before me a few telegrams. They were not sent to me in order to influence me. I say that because the men who sent the telegrams to me, and every other man in Mississippi, already know full well my stand with reference to these programs. I shall read a few of the telegrams, which come to me from the grassroots farm bureaus.

I have a telegram from Itawamba County, Miss. Itawamba County has perhaps more small farms than any other county in my State, and perhaps as many as in any other county in the United States. In Itawamba County farming is not a matter of making money. It is a matter of making a living. The telegram reads:

> We have notice of group recommending repudiation of our agriculture conservation program. Please take care of us. It is doing great work in Itawamba County.

These farmers are not concerned with farming as a money-making proposition. To them it is a matter of livelihood for a family.

I have another telegram which comes from the Rankin County Farm Bureau. It reads:

> Rankin County farmers opposed to reduce agricultural conservation program funds. Urge that you support $285,000,000 as an investment to the welfare of America and the conservation of our soils.

Mr. President, 15 years ago we would not have been receiving such telegrams as these from counties in our States, signed by the small farmers, because the farmers were not soil conservation conscious. They were not thinking in terms of building up their farms. They were thinking and acting more in terms of mining their land. I am not speaking from theory, but from observation.

I have another telegram, which reads:

> The PMA program is very necessary to us farmers.

I have another telegram, from another county. It reads:

> Recommend support Agricultural Appropriation Committee recommendation for agricultural conservation program.

It is signed by T. F. Akers, the president of the Clay County Farm Bureau.

These men know me personally. We have worked together for many years on similar programs. They know how I feel and what my position is. The telegrams come from their hearts, and from their consciousness that this is a wonderful and remarkable program. Let me emphasize the fact that they are very small operators.

Mr. President, instead of reducing the program the thought comes to my mind that we ought to be enlarging it and augmenting it. If there are defects in the program, or if it is not well systematized corrections should be made. If some men are receiving money who are not cooperating, they ought to be deprived of any monetary benefit. I will join with anyone in trying to strengthen the law as to its administration. I am putting the emphasis on the value of the system.

If Senators will pardon me I should like to give a personal illustration. I bought a small tract of timber near my little home town a few years ago. I bought it solely for the timber. It had once been the home of someone. There was some cultivable land, but most of it was in timber. The land had run down to the point where it would not support a family. I did not even look at the cultivable part of the land when inspecting the property. I bought it solely for the timber. While giving some attention to the timber I was walking across the land one day with a farmer friend who pointed to several acres and said, "Those acres could be made into good land." That led me to get into touch with the soil-conservation agent. That led to another step and then another. Without any credit to me, let me say that I am now putting that place back into production, through these processes. I am spending my own money—although not a large sum—with the idea that some day that piece of land will again be a homestead and provide a home for someone who will be able to make a living there. That will not happen to me or to my children, but that piece of land will be returned to productive channels, and will be a homestead and a home where someone, either white or black, will be able to establish his home and raise a family of children.

That is an illustration of the situation in connection with this program. I dis-

like to refer to my personal experience as an example, but of course, a man knows best what is in his own heart.

I do not know what the Government pays each year in such cases in connection with this program. However, the stimulation and example and promotion and know-how that those in the Soil Conservation Service have made available to me are bringing about this result, which is another economic unit, another family unit. In a few more years there will be more Americanism in that county, on that little piece of land than there was when this program started.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will my very gracious colleague, the Senator from Mississippi, yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. STENNIS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There has been some comment as to whether the vote taken by the directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation reflects essentially the grass-roots sentiment of that organization, which has nearly 1,500,000 members.

Let me say that, in the first place, that organization had its annual convention in Dallas in December 1950, and there the delegates from all over the United States—thousands of them—mandated their leadership to come out strongly in favor of economy, wherever it was possible. Of course, that convention occurred quite a while ago.

In January of 1951, a month later, there was a vote in the directorate of the Farm Bureau Federation; and they voted, by 11 to 9, in favor of the very curtailment which now is called for in my amendment to the committee amendment. They reaffirmed that position by a larger vote in July of this year, when the vote was 15 to 2.

I submit to my friend, the Senator from Mississippi, that if the grass-roots farmers were not in favor of this proposal, the Senate would be showered with telegrams in number almost sufficient to fill this Chamber. However, only occasional telegrams have been read into the RECORD to indicate that some farmers probably are not in support of the proposal for sound and deep economy on this issue. I think that situation speaks for itself.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement the Senator from Illinois has made, and I realize that he is very sincere in his representations in connection with both this and other matters, and is a very diligent student of economy. I believe he serves a most useful purpose.

The American Farm Bureau Federation is a great organization, but I believe that those of us who serve in the Senate and who live close to the land have the obligation of determining in this case what the need is and what the program means to the so-called "little fellow." With all due deference to the American Farm Bureau Federation, I personally feel that in connection with the vote taken by the directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation, they were not representing the small farmers or the thought of the small farmers, and that the proposal now before the Senate is contrary to the best interests of the small farmers and, more particularly—and I desire to emphasize and reemphasize this point—it is not favorable to the national, over-all picture and the rebuilding of our land, which in many cases, including the one to which I referred a moment ago, has been virtually mined out.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say that probably few persons in the United States have been a member of the American Farm Bureau Federation longer than I have. However, in this case I am obliged to vote against the desires of the directors of that organization.

I wish to say that I think the position taken by the American Farm Bureau Federation in this matter is perfectly understandable, for, as we know, this great farm organization has been advocating very strongly efficiency and economy in government and reductions in appropriations for many, if not all, the activities of the Government which are not absolutely necessary.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. So I can well understand why that organization feels it would be inconsistent for it to advocate economies in every other branch of the Government service except the one in which it personally is most interested.

The other reason why I believe the American Farm Bureau Federation may take this position is that in many of the States of the Union the Production and Marketing Administration has been used as a political machine. In some places it has been used to attack the American Farm Bureau Federation itself, as well as to attack other farm organizations and people who do not favor going along with the administration's aims and desires.

It is only natural that thinking people, including the farmers, should be resentful of such efforts, which have been made in some States, to use a Federal Government organization, such as the Production and Marketing Administration, for political purposes.

It has been my own sad duty from time to time to expose some of the activities; and even at the present time I notice that the Department of Justice is entering into the picture and is undertaking to correct some of the evils of this organization.

However, the question which arises, and which I pointed out yesterday, is whether we should consider this matter in the light of our own political feelings. My own feeling is one of great resentment that efforts are made to use for political purposes what otherwise would be perfectly sound Government agencies. However, shall we be guided by our own political feelings or shall we be guided by the program itself?

I think we have to determine whether we wish to give up this program completely. The cutting down of expenditures can be carried too far. We shall not do away with the political activities by reducing the expenditures, because if we reduced the total appropriation to $15,000,000, the agency would probably spend the entire $15,000,000 on the local committeemen, who, if they were so minded, would continue to play politics, just as they have done heretofore.

So far as I am concerned, my decision in this case is made comparatively easy by the action of the Vermont Legislature, which without a dissenting vote, so far as I know, memorialized the Congress to appropriate the entire $285,000,000 for this year.

I understand that the $280,000,000 figure, which was arrived at by the subcommittee for agriculture of the Appropriations Committee, is the amount determined to be necessary to carry out the commitments which have already been made for the coming year.

I shall not feel too badly if a cut is made in the program for next year. However, if we make the appropriation too small, we adversely affect the program itself, because in that case too large a percentage of the appropriation will be used for administrative purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My amendment to the committee amendment would reduce the appropriation, not for this year, but for the following year, for the amendment relates to page 33 of the bill, which deals with the program for the following year; and, in essence, that item is the authorization, not the appropriation, for the program for the farmers for the coming year.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I object to a curtailment, regardless of the year which is affected.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am not familiar with the point which has been made by the Senator from Illinois. I knew there would be some funds for the Production and Marketing Administration program, as it pertains to soil improvement.

I wish to concur in what the junior Senator from Illinois said yesterday, namely, that we must find some way to avoid the duplication of effort by these services, namely, the Extension Service, the Production and Marketing Administration, and other services, all of which compete in the same field. It is wasteful, and it should be done away with. However, I should not like to see the entire agricultural program, which has done so much good during the past 15 years, come to grief.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall conclude my statement, and I shall be very brief. I appreciate the contribution made by the Senator from Vermont. What he said was a real contribution, especially what he said about the use of PMA for political purposes. I heartily disapprove of such practices. I remember presiding in the Senate once when the Senator from Vermont was exposing what I thought was a glaring example of that practice in one of the States. I am glad it was exposed. The

same idea applies to the REA or to any of the other Government programs. They will destroy themselves if they are injected into politics, and are used in that way. I think the friends of those programs in the Congress ought to emphasize, at home as well as here, that the line of demarcation shall not be transgressed, and that there will be swift, personal punishment for those who transgress it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I have tried to point out, in the past, and I am glad the Senator from Mississippi is pointing it out again today, that when a Government agency such as the REA, the PMA, or the SCS—the latter a State agency, principally—or any other agency, is used for political purposes, those who so use it are simply seeking a short-cut to the termination of the work of the agency itself. We must put a stop to that practice.

Mr. STENNIS. The farmer on the land should know that he is being used for the personal purposes of those who are in charge of his program, and that they will destroy his program.

Mr. AIKEN. I think he knows it now better than he did 2 or 3 years ago.

Mr. STENNIS. I hope he does. That brings me, Mr. President, to the remaining point which I desired to make. As a contrast to certain States where the program may be abused, I had occasion to examine the administration of the soil-conservation programs in my State not long ago. I found it to be working in a most laudable way, so far as I could tell, it is an outstanding illustration of a program which emanates from Washington, but which is really being administered on the ground level by those taking part in the program, the local authorities and representatives chosen by the Secretary. Every State has a law which provides the machinery for the administration of the program, and it gives to the commissioners who are selected by the participants in the programs vast power, almost equal to that of eminent domain. It is the equivalent of eminent domain in many respects, and it is a power which has never been abused. In county after county, I have found the commissioners performing their duties efficiently. They were dirt farmers, men who were on the ground, and who were functioning without pay. They may get an allowance for travel, or something of the sort, when they go somewhere, but they do not receive salaries. They are functioning in a very fine manner, under skillful technical direction, and the results which are to be seen as one rides along the road are arresting. Improvement is noticeable at the cotton gin, at the corn crib, and at other places where farm products are brought.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with what the Senator from Mississippi has said in relation to the small committeemen, who are selected by the farmers, being poorly paid; I agree with that part of his statement. On the other hand, is it not a fact that the top personnel of this agency, those who draw the high salaries, are selected and appointed by the administration in Washington, upon approval by the Democratic National Committee?

Mr. STENNIS. I do not know about the selections, or by whom they are approved; I have not kept myself informed about that. Of course, the program is administered at the top by the Federal Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is certainly true.

Mr. STENNIS. But the real power of administration is vested in the local committee. Sometimes the local committee will surrender more or less to higher authority, but the power is in the local committee, to be used by them; and in many counties they use the power. They really run the programs, the technical aspects of which are taken care of, as I have said, by those on the higher level.

I believe that the trend is toward improvement. As we proceed from year to year, I am sure the administration of this program is improving. It is improving, for one reason, because the farmer has seen that it is really something worthy of his cooperation, worthy of his interest, and that it is worth while to him. It has really developed along that line.

Mr. President, as I yield the floor, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, the five telegrams to which I referred in the presentation I have just made to the Senate.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FULTON, MISS., *May 14, 1951.*

Hon. JOHN STENNIS,
United States Senate:

We have notice of group recommending repudiation of our agriculture conservation program. Please take care of us. It is doing great work in Itawamba County.

A. J. MATTOX.

WEST POINT, MISS., *May 14, 1951.*

Hon. JOHN C. STENNIS,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

Recommend support agricultural appropriation committee recommendation for agricultural conservation program.

T. F. AKERS,
President, Clay County Farm Bureau.

JACKSON, MISS., *May 15, 1951.*

Senator JOHN C. STENNIS,
Washington, D. C.:

Rankin County farmers opposed to reduce agricultural conservation program funds. Urge that you support $285,000,000 as an investment to the welfare of America and the conservation of our soils.

RANKIN COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
ROBERT C. WILLIAMS, *President.*

COLUMBUS, MISS., *May 17, 1951.*

Hon. JOHN C. STENNIS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Please use your influence to defeat the proposed cut in ACP program. ACP is playing an essential part in development of livestock program in balancing agricultural income in this county. The Lowndes County Farm Bureau does not recommend a cut below present funds.

T. K. WILLS, *President.*
T. W. HARDY, *Vice President.*
T. E. WIGGINS, *Secretary-Treasurer.*
W. R. TAYLOR, *Director.*
C. D. WIGGINS, *Director.*
W. A. SWOOPE, *Director.*
H. B. WELLS, *Director.*

ABERDEEN, MISS., *May 18, 1951.*

Senator JOHN C. STENNIS,
Washington, D. C.:

The PMA program is very necessary to us farmers.

WILL BREWER.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I had intended to propose an amendment which would have produced a saving identical to that proposed by my colleague from Illinois and the Senator from Delaware; but, since I was compelled to be in my home State yesterday, it was impossible for me to have the amendment submitted and printed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will my colleague from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Last week, when we were trying to get an agreement on this bill, my colleague very specifically reserved time on this amendment in particular, I am sure, before pressing business took him to Illinois. I assured him then that if, in the following week, he failed to return in time, he need have no misgivings, for the amendment would be offered. I am sure that, had the Senator been on the floor when we reached the page of the bill now under consideration, he would have offered the amendment. I felt I should make that explanation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank my colleague.

It is very easy, as we discuss individual items in the appropriation bills, to concentrate our attention exclusively upon the benefits which will be given by making a specific appropriation, and to lose sight of the general budgetary situation which we face. The plain truth is that, if the President's budget is followed in its entirety, we face expenditures of approximately $73,000,000,000, plus such increases as may be hinted at, and which were hinted at in the President's midyear economic report. The probable yield of the present tax rates will not exceed $61,000,000,000; so that we face a deficit of $12,000,000,000. Unless we make good that deficit by reducing expenditures, and by increasing taxes, the Government will be forced to borrow billions and billions and billions of dollars.

From whom will it get the money? It will be compelled, in the main, to go to the banks. The banks will lend the Government credit, which will mean that they will enter upon their books as credit a certain proportion of their capital, which they will then make available, to be drawn upon by the Government. In other words, the total supply of bank credit will be increased, and when there is an increase in the total amount of bank credit in relationship to goods, prices, which are the ratio between the two, will inevitably increase. So, unless we make the deficit good, we are in for inflation. It will be futile to pass a price-

controls bill, no matter how stringent its character may be, if we are inflating the currency and inflating private credit at the same time.

I think I can say that with good conscience, because I did my level best, both in committee and on the floor of the Senate, to get a strong price-control bill passed. But the most important consideration, so far as concerns holding prices down, is balancing the Federal budget and preventing the banks from expanding private credit at the same time. An individual controls bill, a bill providing for direct control of prices, however valuable it may be, is not as important as balancing the budget, and also restraining the total supply of private credit. It is sheer hypocrisy—and I emphasize the word—to have a Government deficit and to have an inflation of bank credit, on the one hand, and then to say, "Yes, we are for holding down inflation by direct price controls."

Mr. President, we cannot raise the full $12,000,000,000 by additional taxation. I think it is probable that we shall be doing very well if we raise $7,000,000,000 by added taxes. That means that if in a period of full employment we are to prevent a deficit, which can only lead to inflation, we shall have to reduce expenditures by not far from $5,000,000,000. That means the cuts in the budget will have to be very stringent as to some items. There will be many things we would like to have that we shall have to do without because of the war emergency and the need for defense.

As we come to any individual item of appropriation, the friends of that item will always say, "This is not the place to cut. Cut somewhere else." If we listen to them we shall be constantly rushing into a promising room only to be told, "This is not the room where we should cut." We shall rush out of that room and go to another room, only to have the door of that room slammed in our faces, and we shall emerge at the end without any economy whatsoever. Oh, yes; we should always cut somewhere else. That means that if we are really in earnest about the question of economy we should put each appropriation to the test and see whether it is vitally needed, absolutely essential, or whether it could not be cut without too great loss.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MOODY. I think the Senator from Illinois has made a good point. He has been doing a good work, and much as I should like to see the appropriation go through as it is, I believe the Senator from Illinois is correct in stating that if we are really going to have economy in the Government, this is one of the places where we must have it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator.

Let us review the situation, Mr. President. Let us recall that this is not the only soil conservation program which the Government is operating. There is also, as everyone knows, the Soil Conservation Service which is organizing soil conservation districts and engaging in wholesale efforts to conserve the soil by encouraging contour farming, by the planting of trees upon hillsides, by encouraging the development of small dams, the development of farm lakes, the planting of legumes which will be nitrogen-building, and a whole series of other measures. That Soil Conservation Service, under the direction of Dr. H. H. Bennett, has been of enormous value to the country, and it is not concerned in this appropriation at all.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course the Senator from Illinois is correct in saying the administrative costs of the Soil Conservation Service are not involved in this appropriation, but surely he must see the relationship between the practices to which he has referred and the program of the Soil Conservation Service in given areas. The soil conservation district, which, incidentally, is organized under State laws, prescribes a program for a given area, and then the Federal assistance to the farmers is used to carry out the programs. The payments are not made by the Soil Conservation Service; they are made by the Production and Marketing Administration, but they are made for carrying out practices which are approved and prescribed within given areas by the Soil Conservation Service.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I notice on page 29 of the bill an appropriation for salaries and expenses, Soil Conservation Service, of $53,474,991. The authorization about which I am speaking is on page 33, under "Production and Marketing Administration."

Mr. RUSSELL. That is what I was calling attention to, that the payments are made by the Production and Marketing Administration, but they are made for the purpose of carrying out practices prescribed by the Soil Conservation Service.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Prescribed by sensible standards generally.

Mr. RUSSELL. According to the viewpoint of the Senator from Illinois; but he was approving of the Soil Conservation Service, as I understood him. The other Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] undertook to cut the appropriation 22 or 23 percent. But there is a very direct relationship between the work of the Soil Conservation Service and the practices carried out under the payments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would say that in the case of the Soil Conservation Service, we provide technical assistance for sound soil conservation practices, and in the case of the Production and Marketing Administration what we really have is bonus payments for carrying out these practices. The historical origin of those payments is interesting. In 1933 Congress passed the first AAA Act in order to contract acreage of farm crops and keep prices from falling so low. I believe we all remember that in late 1935 the first AAA Act was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in the Butler decision, and, in order to restrict acreage, a new program was developed. The new program which was developed and approved in February of 1936 was the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. It allowed the Government to restrict acreage under the guise of conservation. That is, it provided for bonus payments to farmers for the withdrawal of acreage from cultivation, provided the acreage thus withdrawn had soil conservation practices instituted upon it, such as the planting of grass or trees. But although the soil-conservation aspects were important the real purpose behind the 1936 act and the bonus payments to make it effective was to take land out of cultivation and reduce current production. So I say that this system had its origin in bonus payments to the farmer for the purpose of acreage restrictions. That is how the system got started. The soil conservation practices were primarily, shall I say, the constitutional excuse which was used to get around the Supreme Court decision in the Butler case.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Illinois is, of course, entitled to his opinion as to its being purely a bonus program. We might go back to the message of President Franklin D. Roosevelt urging the institution of the soil-conservation program, which I think was one of the greatest achievements of his administration. The Senator will find that President Roosevelt laid great emphasis on the national responsibility for the natural asset we have in our fertile soil.

I should like to have the Senator from Illinois explain what he means by the expression "under the guise of conservation." Would he say that the millions of acres of land which have been taken out of cultivation and planted in trees are merely a guise of conservation, or is it not true conservation to take submarginal land out of cultivation and plant it in trees to preserve the soil, in addition to growing trees which are so vital to our people?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly there was a dual purpose, but it was very convenient to find the soil-conservation excuse to justify the acreage reduction which could not have been put into effect directly, once the Supreme Court had knocked out the first AAA.

In 1938 Congress passed the second AAA bill, this time not basing its authority on the taxing power, as was true of the first AAA, but on the spending power of Congress which the courts have ordinarily left almost completely free. In other words, acreage allotments then became divorced from the individual system of soil conservation, but the bonus payments lingered on.

Despite the fact that the Soil Conservation Service continued and a new system of acreage allotments was adopted the bonus payments to the farmer under the guise of soil conservation payments have been continued for 14 years. During that time I believe a great deal of good has been done. Lime and phosphate have been placed on the land, and there has been some terracing. There has been some encouragement of contour plowing, and some development of

small dams, farm lakes, and ponds. A great deal of good has been done. But there has been a 14-year experimental period, and what I am trying to say is that on the well-to-do farms the work has now been carried to the point where the well-to-do farmers on good farm land can continue the work on their own. After all the well-to-do farmer is pretty intelligent. He or his sons are trained generally at the State agricultural college. They know soil conservation practices particularly as a result of such training. Most farmers now put lime and phosphate on the soil, and would continue to do so and participate in other conservation practices even if the payment were removed. It is not necessary to give the majority of the farmers a piece of candy in order to induce them to drink a glass of milk. They like milk, and they know soil conservation practices are beneficial to them. I say the majority of them do. For the well established, prosperous farms in flat, fertile areas, I do not believe that such a payment as this is needed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UNDERWOOD in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont. I think I know what he is going to ask.

Mr. AIKEN. I was going to say that it is not candy altogether that is offered the farmer that helps him to produce the largest crops. It is the fact that most farmers are very busy and they are given to procrastination. In the fall they do not get around to order their lime and their fertilizer when they ought to. When it comes time to plant and they go for their lime and fertilizer they find they are unable to obtain it. I state that as a fact based on experience.

One of the greatest values to come from the soil-improvement program is the activity of the local committeeman who visits each farmer in the community, along in October and November, sits down with him and induces him to place his order for the fertilizer and the lime for the coming crop year. That is one of the greatest benefits to come from the program. I think many farmers would neglect placing their orders until it was too late to obtain the material if they were not reminded by the local committeeman.

I am merely pointing that out from practical experience and trying to make it clear that it is not so much what the farmer gets from the Government that has helped increase agricultural production as it is the fact that through an organization he is prompted to place his orders earlier.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would think the $150,000,000 which would still be provided by the amendment would be sufficient to provide an organization with which to jog the memories and anticipations of the farmers of the country.

Mr. President, I want to point out, if I may, that the pending bill provides that the payments shall be formulated—and I read—"on the basis of a distribution of the funds available for payments and grants among the several States in accordance with their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary."

What I am trying to say is this: I quite well grant that there are certain States where farm income is low and where the soil is greatly depleted, which probably need such payments as these. I hope my southern friends will not take it amiss if I say that I think the vast majority of Southern States fall in this category, whereas most of the State of Illinois is not. Illinois gets a large amount of this money—last year $9,316,000. I do not want to cross the Missippi River, and refer to the neighboring State of Iowa, which gets somewhat more—$10,000,000—but I think the farmers of Iowa—and perhaps the Senators from Iowa will correct this statement if I am in error—know their situation pretty well, and they do not need $10,000,000.

I have, as a matter of fact, telegrams from the Farm Bureau of Iowa, and from Farm Bureaus of a number of other States in the Union, which I shall later ask unanimous consent to put in the RECORD, asking that this program be cut to $150,000,000. The grants to the States represented by these telegrams amounted to $75,000,000 last year.

In the votes which were taken inside the American Farm Bureau Federation last winter, the votes to reduce the program came from the Northern States and the Middle Western States, and the votes to continue it at present levels came from the Southern States.

I should be perfectly willing, Mr. President, to have the Secretary of Agriculture, who will have the power, use all this money to help the poorer areas where soil conservation is needed the most. I am perfectly willing to have that done. I do not want to hurt the program greatly in those areas which need it the most, but I do say that in central Illinois, where the farm land is as rich as in any other area of the country, the overwhelming opinion of the farmers is that they do not need the appropriation.

The farmers have been insisting, and I think properly, that we should reduce Federal expenditures. Most people, when they say we should reduce Federal expenditures, say "Yes, but not on my item." The Farm Bureau Federation faced this issue very clearly. They realized that they could not ask to have other appropriations cut if they insisted that this appropriation should be maintained intact. Therefore they said that they would be willing to have this appropriation cut. Not only were they willing to have it cut, but they were anxious to have it cut in order that their hands might be clean when they worked for decreases in other items.

Mr. President, while in some matters I have disagreed with the American Farm Bureau Federation, and I reserve my right to continue to disagree with them in the future, I desire to say that in this respect, as in so many other cases, the farm bureaus have shown statesmanship and patriotism of the highest order. They are willing to take cuts themselves in order to establish a precedent so that we can cut the budget as a whole. The farm bureau of my State, the Illinois Agricultural Association, which incidentally has about 80 percent of the some 200,000 farmers amongst its membership, is ready to have the appropriations for Illinois cut on a very drastic scale in order that we may be consistent in our commitments for economy. I have talked with the president of the Illinois Agricultural Association, Mr. Charles Sherman, about the general problem of economy. He has done a fine job, not only in working for budget reductions in other areas but also in this Department of Agriculture itself. This is true statesmanship.

Mr. President, $150,000,000 will be sufficient to take care of the farmers whose land is now being badly depleted and whose incomes are low. The money should be given to them to induce those now engaging in them to continue proper practices, and to get others started in such practices. But the prosperous farmers, the well-trained farmers, the farmers with rich land, after having had this program for 14 years, do not need to be spoon-fed in the future. They now feel that they know enough so that they can proceed on their own speed.

Mr. President, I think there is too much of a tendency to treat the farmers as incompetents and as wards. The farmers, in the main, are self-respecting, dignified persons. In the majority of cases they do not need Federal agents constantly coming around to them and telling them to use phosphate and lime and to do this and that. They have the county-agent system to help them in such matters, to give them information on general agricultural practices as well as the technical assistance of experts in the Soil Conservation Service. They do not need a bribe. They do not need a bonus.

The areas where the soil is badly depleted, in the Southern States, in certain sections of my own State, particularly the southern portion of the State, can continue to receive payments out of the $150,000,000 which would still be authorized. What we would be eliminating would be the $130,000,000 bonus to the prosperous farmers in rich farming areas who do not need it, who do not want it, and who believe that in the cause of self-respect they should not ask these payments for themselves which they are not willing to accord to others. As they properly demand economies in the budget as a whole, they are willing to take economies in the matters which lie close to their own interests.

So, Mr. President, I hope very much that this amendment will be adopted.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point telegrams which I have received from the American Farm Bureau Federation, from the Illinois Agricultural Association, from the Kansas Farm Bureau, from the Colorado Farm Bureau, from the Oregon Farm Bureau, from the Wisconsin Farm Bureau, from the Oklahoma Farm Bureau, from the Wyoming Farm Bureau, from the Idaho Farm Bureau, from the New Hampshire Farm Bureau, from the

Maryland Farm Bureau, from the Missouri Farm Bureau, from the Washington Farm Bureau, from the Indiana Farm Bureau, from the Iowa Farm Bureau, from the Virginia Farm Bureau, and from a number of county farm bureaus, the so-called grass-roots organizations to which reference has been made.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 24, 1951.*
Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Reduction of Federal expenditures absolutely essential part sound inflation-control program. Welfare of all citizens, farmers included, placed in jeopardy unless basic causes of inflation are checked. Farmers are willing to do their fair share toward accomplishing this objective. Statement on behalf of American Farm Bureau Federation mailed you July 18 contains recommendations, with particular reference agricultural appropriations. Especially urge your support Douglas amendment reducing agricultural conservation payments authorization for 1952 crop program to $150,000,000.

ROGER FLEMING,
Secretary-Treasurer, American Farm Bureau Federation.

CHICAGO, ILL., *July 24, 1951.*
Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building:

We are giving full support to your move to reduce ACP payments to $150,000,000.

CHARLES B. SHUMAN,
President, Illinois Agricultural Association.

MANHATTAN, KANS., *July 24, 1951.*
Senator PAUL DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please inform Senators RUSSELL and ELLENDER of the Senate Appropriations Committee that the Kansas Farm Bureau Board, in session at Manhattan, Kans., today, endorses the recommendation of the American Farm Bureau Federation relative to reduction in agriculture conservation payments for the 1952 year. We appreciate the amendment that you are offering for a reduction in these payments to $150,000,000. You have the support of the Kansas Farm Bureau on this reduction in Federal appropriations.

H. A. PRAEGER,
President, Kansas Farm Bureau.

DENVER, COLO., *July 24, 1951.*
United States Senator DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Majority Colorado farmers and ranchers wish to compliment you for your stand in reducing PMA conservations payments to a minimum. Sizable section also favor elimination completely. While program is good one in times like this, we must reduce nondefense spending in order to control inflation. Many practices now paid for are regular part of farmers and ranchers program and will be done anyway.

COLORADO FARM BUREAU,
L. V. TOYNE,
Executive Secretary.

SALEM, OREG., *July 25, 1951.*
Senator DOUGLAS,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

In line with our dead serious demands that nonessential Govenment spending be curtailed we ask that you vigorously support Senator Douglas amendment reducing ACP Authority 1952 crop year to $150,000,000. Our resolutions helped write the policy which has dictated the recommendation of the American Farm Bureau on agricultural aprpopriations.

We stand back of them 100 percent. In a series of meetings throughout the State I have referred to the evident necessity of farm organizations being forced by the administration to fight for economies in our own department of agriculture. We are at war. Truman asks for more taxes for mobilization. If we don't start economizing on nonessentials all the stop-gap controls they can borrow from Stalin can't stop run-away inflation. The farmers ask, yes, beg for this first concrete step in unselfish economy. The burden of action rests with you and your colleagues.

MARSHALL SWEARINGEN,
President, Oregon Farm Bureau Federation.

MADISON, WIS., *July 24, 1951.*
Senator PAUL DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Wisconsin Farm Bureau voting delegates by resolution asked continuing review of ACP payments with reduction consistent with greater economy in government. Urge your support for $150,000,000 top for ACP.

JAMES C. GREEN,
Executive Secretary-Treasurer, Wisconsin Bureau Federation.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *July 24, 1951.*
The Honorable PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building:

Hope you will vote Wednesday to support our position in re nonessential Federal expenditures, including reduction ACP payments. This is essential part inflation control program.

JOHN I. TAYLOR,
President, Oklahoma Farm Bureau.

LARAMIE, WYO., *July 24, 1951.*
Senator DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Wyoming Farm Bureau Federation representing 5,798 ranch and farm families in Wyoming endorse the position of the American Farm Bureau Federation regarding amendment reducing ACP authorization for 1952 crop year to $150,000,000. We especially urge you to study and consider AFBF's anti-inflation program. Reducing nondefense spending is an integral part of program.

WYOMING FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
J. W. PAULSON, *Executive Secretary.*

POCATELLO, IDAHO, *July 24, 1951.*
Senator DOUGLAS,
Washington, D. C.:

Idaho Farm Bureau Federation representing over 11,000 farm families endorses American Farm Bureau Federation recommendations on agricultural appropriations of July 11, 1951. Particularly recommend sizable reductions in appropriations for United States Department of Agriculture. Recommend that authorization for 1952 agricultural conservation program be reduced from budget recommendation of $285,000,000 to $150,000,000. Urge you support our efforts to reduce all nonessential Federal expenditures.

L. D. BROWNING,
Assistant State Secretary, Idaho Farm Bureau Federation, Pocatello, Idaho.

CONCORD, N. H., *July 24, 1951.*
Senator PAUL DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you support recommeded cuts in agriculture appropriations as presented by Mr. Kline. In New Hampshire our voting delegates passed a resolution urging that more that "lip service" be given to reduction in nondefense spendings. We don't need any more ACP money than Mr. Kline proposed under present conditions.

ALFRED L. FRENCH,
New Hampshire Farm Bureau.

BALTIMORE, MD., *July 24, 1951.*
Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge reduction nonessential appropriations including agricultural items. Request soil-conservation program funds for 1952 be cut to one hundred fifty million.

C. E. WISE, Jr.,
Secretary-Treasurer, Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc.

JEFFERSON CITY, MO., *July 24, 1951.*
Hon. PAUL DOUGLAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Missouri Farm Bureau Federation board in session today unanimously endorse American Farm Bureau Federation recommendation on agricultural appropriations with particular reference to reduction in agricultural payments. At a time when defense expenditures are mounting it is of the utmost importance that we reduce such expenditures as agricultural conservation payments.

H. E. SLUSHER,
President of the Board, Missouri Farm Bureau Federation.

SPOKANE, WASH., *July 24, 1951.*
Senator PAUL DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Farmers in Washington fear inflation and vigorously support real reduction in nonessential governmental expenditures as one essential part of a broad program of inflation control. Therefore they support the recommendations of the American Farm Bureau Federation reducing agricultural appropriations with emphasis on cutting ACP payments to $150,000,000.

RALPH T. GILLESPIE,
President, Washington State Farm Bureau.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *July 24, 1951.*
Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

American Farm Bureau Federation in economy drive takes lead in suggesting drastic reduction in ACP payments at this time. Strong for preservation of fundamental principles Production and Marketing Administration. Important make drastic expenditure reduction by cutting to the bone. Strong move against inflation. Urge cut in ACP appropriations to $150,000,000.

HASSIL E. SCHENCK,
President, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc.

DES MOINES, IOWA, *July 24, 1951.*
Senator DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Iowa Farm Bureau board of directors in session today passed a resolution requesting your support for reduction of ACP appropriation to one hundred and fifty million. Essential parts of program can be maintained on this figure. Agriculture willing to

take its share of sacrifices necessary to pare governmental expenses to the limit.

E. HOWARD HILL,
President.

RICHMOND, VA., *July 24, 1951.*

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Washington, D. C.:

We are much concerned that Congress has thus far taken little action that will be really effective in controlling inflation. Our opinion unbalanced Federal budget greatest single inflationary factor. Unless this accomplished, see little chance escaping effects disastrous inflation. Great majority our leading farmers support action. Our board backing position American Farm Bureau regarding curtailment nonessential Federal expenditures, including reduction conservation payments from two hundred and eight-five to one hundred and fifty million for next year. We urge your support this position.

H. G. BLALOCK,
President, Virginia Farm Bureau Federation.

CALDWELL, IDAHO, *July 25, 1951.*

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:

Following annual meeting resolution that nonessential Government spending be curtailed, urge you to vote for amendment reducing ACP authorization in line AFBF recommendation July 11, 1951.

CANYON COUNTY FARM BUREAU.

CALDWELL, IDAHO, *July 25, 1951.*

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge you to vote for amendment reducing ACP authorization as AFBF recommendation July 11, 1951, in line with reducing nonessential Government spending.

WAYNE NAUGLE,
Director, Franklin Farm Bureau.
C. E. RHOADS,
Chairman of Greenleaf Farm Bureau.

ONTARIO, OREG., *July 25, 1951.*

PAUL DOUGLAS,
Washington, D. C.:

Payette County, Idaho, Farm Bureau urges reduction in agriculture conservation payments in 1952 to $150,000,000 as per AFBF recommendation of July 11, 1951.

M. K. SNOWBERGER, *Secretary.*

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is only natural, once a program like this is started, that many people want to continue to feed at the public trough. There came into my hands recently a letter issued by the National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc., asking that $285,000,000 be approved for this appropriation. The letter is signed by Mr. Robert M. Koch. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL
LIMESTONE ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Washington, D. C., May 10, 1951.

To Members and Supporters of the Agricultural Conservation Program:

Debate on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, H. R. 3973, was stopped tonight before the section, which on page 33, line 4, authorizes $225,000,000 for the 1952 agricultural conservation program was reached. The House will not continue debate on the Department of Agriculture bill until Tuesday noon, May 15. In the meantime, those who wish to support the agricultural conservation program have got to take positive action to see that Congressmen adequately understand and support the agricultural conservation program.

As you know from our previous letters, Congressman FRED MARSHALL, of Minnesota, plans to offer an amendment to keep the agricultural conservation program at $285,000,000 because of his belief that this program has already been cut far enough. As we also told you, the American Farm Bureau Federation is making a concerted drive to cut this program. Reproduced on the back of this letter is a letter which they sent to the House Appropriations Committee the day before they were to take action on this bill. The following telegram was sent to every Congressman this morning by Allen B. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation:

"Reduction Federal expenditures absolutely essential part sound inflation control program. Unless we control inflation we jeopardize the freedom of all citizens—farmers included. Therefore, farmers willing to do their fair share toward accomplishing this objective specifically urge your support Cox amendment agricultural appropriation bill to reduce agricultural conservation program funds for 1952 crop year to $150,000,000.

"ALLEN B. KLINE,
"President, American Farm Bureau Federation."

This indicates Congressman Cox, of Georgia, will attempt to reduce the ACP program. Today many Congressmen, both Republicans and Democrats, pleaded with the House not to make cuts in appropriations which were really investments in our natural resources. Unless farmers throughout the country will write, wire, or call their Congressmen and encourage them to support the agricultural conservation program and Congressman FRED MARSHALL's amendment to keep this program at $285,000,000, the appropriation is apt to be reduced as it was 3 years ago. Remember, a card, letter, wire, or telephone call will help to offset the intense activity of the American Farm Bureau Federation. Don't forget that our survey in the State of New York showed not only that 82 percent of the 10,000 farmers surveyed wanted this program continued and increased, but that 77 percent of them stated that they were Farm Bureau members.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT M. KOCH,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, why do you suppose the National Agricultural Limestone Association is interested in this appropriation? It is interested in the appropriation because the more money the Federal Government spends in this way the greater the demand for limestone. I am not attacking the limestone producers——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, I agree that the limestone producers have a very selfish interest in this program because they like to sell limestone to be placed on the land. But it seems to me that the statement of the Senator from Illinois that they know this program will cause more limestone to be used on the land is inconsistent with his general contention that the farmers will not participate whether they receive Federal assistance or not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What I meant to say was that the well-to-do farmers on good farm land would follow such practices anyway. Farmers who have had training at the agricultural colleges would do so.

Mr. President, I am not for the complete abolition of this program. I favor using the funds for the soil on poor farms and the areas where there is the greatest soil depletion. I think the money could be well spent there. But to pay farmers whose land is worth $450 an acre, who are not in debt, and who have farms of from 160 to 320 acres, a subsidy in order to put limestone or phosphate on the land is carrying the welfare state too far. I am for the welfare state within limits, provided it is directed to the people who really need it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the Senator knows that the amendment which he is so eloquently advocating has no reference whatever to any need clause, as suggested by the Farm Bureau upon which he depends. The Farm Bureau states that if the appropriation were reduced by $150,000,000, it should be distributed on the basis of need. When I challenged the Senator's colleague [Mr. DIRKSEN] upon that point, he fell back on an antiquated provision which limits the reduction in any State to 15 percent below the amount which that State received the previous year. Such a provision would in nowise be applicable. It would not in the slightest degree be applicable to the pending amendment, because the provision referred to was placed in the law back in 1947. I was the author of the need provision then. The Eightieth Congress was determined to reduce soil conservation appropriations by $150,000,000, the same amount as the reduction which the Senator from Illinois now urges; and it did so over my earnest objection. I then took the position that the appropriation should be distributed on the basis of need, and I succeeded in having placed in the bill a provision making the distribution on that basis.

Other language was offered, providing that a reduction in any State could not be made to exceed 15 percent. That language is still in the law. Therefore, any reference to that language as being a need proviso is absolutely futile, unless the 15-percent limitation is stricken out.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if the pending amendment to reduce the total amount from $280,000,000 to $150,000,000 is adopted, I shall then move to strike the clause restricting the reduction in any State to not more than 15 percent, so that there can be a complete allocation on the basis of need. Georgia and other Southern States need not worry in the slightest about having their payments reduced to any great degree. We in the Midwest are ready to take the major reduction. We are not asking for anything, but we want some economy in the Federal Government, and we are willing to give up our claim upon the Public Treasury.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate the Senator's solicitude for the State of Georgia.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I merely used it as an illustration.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate that. We have made great progress under the soil-conservation program. I do not know whether or not we would benefit now under the need clause. In the early days of the program we would have benefited under such a clause. However, we have made great strides forward.

The Senator from Illinois refers to the farmers who do not want these payments thrust upon them. Any farmer who does not want to take the payments can mail the checks back or refuse to sign up for the program. There is nothing to compel the farmers of Illinois to take this money. However, they have been taking the checks, in spite of their insistence that they do not want the payments. No one is compelling them to take the money.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Our good Lord taught us in His prayer to pray, "Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil." He not only wanted to have us delivered from evil, but he did not want to have us led into temptation. Many people want to be led into temptation, but do not want to succumb to evil. If one does not want to succumb to evil, the best way to avoid it is to keep away from temptation. That is why we in many parts of Illinois want to preserve ourselves from being tempted by the insidious wiles of a Federal check to undermine our independence.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is protecting them after they have done very well under this program for several years. Illinois has been getting more money than almost any other State.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is not that all the more to the credit of the States which have been receiving large amounts of money, and which are now willing to give it up in order to save money for the Government?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was congratulating the Senator on his determined effort to remove his farmers from temptation. They certainly have succumbed to it in every instance during the past 10 or 12 years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is not my effort to save the farmers of Illinois from temptation. It is the proposal of the farmers as a whole that they do not want to be tempted.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Illinois is fighting to relieve them from temptation, and I think that is a very noble purpose. Up to now they have withstood everything but temptation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was the comment of Oscar Wilde. He said that he could resist everything except temptation.

Mr. President, we have an opportunity to save $130,000,000. I do not believe that anyone can say that that is "peanuts." We can still continue the soil-conservation practices of the Soil Conservation Service whose experts give technical assistance free of charge. The county agents will still be offering advice. The areas which need it most can still receive these payments. If this reduction goes through, I shall move to strike out the clause of which the Senator from Georgia complains, so that the States which have the most soil depletion can get the money. We are not trying to feed at the public trough.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to finish this paragraph, which I thought was going to be rather good rhetorically. [Laughter.]

What we are asking is that the Congress get down to business on the question of economy. We must save $5,000,000,000. Up to date, the total reductions made by the House and Senate have saved only about $1,300,000,000. We are running behind. There has been a slackening in the economy drive in the past 2 weeks which has been perfectly evident.

It is unpleasant to take money away from anyone. Once the Government starts disbursing public money, vested interests develop. People who want to receive the money, such as those who sell limestone and phosphate—and I do not attack them—are looking for the money. There develops whole groups of vested interests, built around a subsidy. We have them in shipbuilding; we have them in the airlines; I believe we have them in the railroad industry; we have them in the newspaper and magazine business; we have them in direct mail advertising and in the mail-order houses. Group after group gets a subsidy at public expense without performing equivalent service.

What we need, Mr. President, is a major operation. But every time the knife is put into our hand, our courage falters and our determination weakens. We say, "Now is not the time. This is not the place. This is not the proper manner. Some other time. Some other place. In some other manner."

For some grow weary too soon,
And some turn to other paths,
Setting before the light,
The faint far off image of delight.
And many are the delights beneath the sun.
—*Euripides, from Hippolytus.*

So temptation sweeps across this body, the economies are not put into effect, and the danger of inflation increases.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have finished my paragraph, and I believe it has turned out to be not so very rhetorical after all.

Mr. AIKEN. It sounded great from where the Senator from Vermont was standing. The Senator from Illinois almost touched on what was in my mind. It was his reference to saving $130,000,000. I was going to suggest that if we are to save $130,000,000, instead of distributing the money to five or six million farm families, we could build two more big ships and give them as a present to some great big shipbuilding company.

Mr. DOUGLAS. God save us from that. If the alternative is between distributing $130,000,000 among farmers or to two big shipping companies, I would say we should distribute the money among the farmers. If we are to pass out subsidies, I would rather have small subsidies given to a large number of people instead of an enormous subsidy passed out to a few persons. But I do not believe that is the alternative. The alternative is to keep the money in the pocketbooks of the taxpayers, in order to prevent governmental deficits and to give subsidies to none.

Mr. AIKEN. I was going to suggest, although I do not know how much success both Senators from Illinois will have with this particular amendment in cutting this particular appropriation by $130,000,000, that I am certain they will find it much easier in this Congress to take $130,000,000 from six or seven million farmers than in keeping $130,000,000 from one or more of the big shipbuilding companies.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That may well be. I do not wish to pin roses on myself, but I should like to say that for the past 2 years on every occasion when it was possible I have tried to call the attention of the Senate to the abuses connected with subsidies in the building and operation of ships. I have not done as much in this respect as has been done by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], who deserves the thanks not only of the Senate but of the Nation as a whole for the way in which he has exposed improper subsidies. I have done a little bit in that respect, and I shall continue to fight against unjust subsidies. However, the fact that a subsidy is unjust in one case does not justify giving a subsidy in another case.

Mr. AIKEN. While I have spoken facetiously at times, I wish to say seriously and in all sincerity that no Senator has tried harder to promote good government, economical government, and honest government than has the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the case of ships, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has done more than I have done.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall yield to the Senator from Oregon knowing that I am about to become the target for some very sharp barbs.

Mr. MORSE. I assure the Senator from Illinois that the Senator from Oregon realizes——

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the Senator from Oregon to pause a minute? I wish to say that before the Senator from Delaware took up the cause of fighting ship subsidies the very able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] had been very active in the fight as chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Delaware deserve the thanks of the country for what they have done.

Mr. AIKEN. After campaigning for many years against the looting of the Treasury by shipping interests I felt that I could very well bequeath to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] my interest in shipping [laughter]. I can be certain that the legacy has fallen into good hands. I am furthermore certain that one or both of them will be much more effective than has been the Senator from Vermont in the 7 or 8 years during which he tried to bring some

order out of chaos and some honesty out of corruption.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Vermont has given us a good legacy. I hope he will not rest on his laurels. I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Speaking jocularly, Mr. President, I wish to assure the Senator from Illinois that, whereas he does not seek to pin a rose on himself, I do not rise to pin a rose on him, either; I should like to have him prick his finger on this thorn. He spoke about his desire to keep money in the taxpayers' pockets. I wonder whether the Senator from Illinois has any program for keeping the precious topsoil on the land of this country. It continues, even the topsoil of the great and fertile State of Illinois, to go down the Mississippi River, as I have seen that muddy river many times. The amendment which the Senator from Illinois proposes would cut right into the soil-conservation program. Such a program, from the standpoint of American posterity, is worth many times the millions of dollars the Senator from Illinois believes he would save by the adoption of the amendment which he now offers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly that point must be considered. It is true that we need soil conservation. My point is that we will still retain the agencies for technical assistance for soil conservation, both in the form of Soil Conservation Service and county agent services. They can offer advice to the large and prosperous farmers, whose economic interest in protecting their own soil is very real. In the case of the marginal or submarginal farmers, whose soil is generally depleted, $150,000,000 will still be available, and it can be offered to them, and should be offered to them. They can be led along to adopt and to retain desirable farm practices. However, after 15 years it seems to me the prosperous farmers on rich farm land do not need this additional subsidy. In many cases it is for them merely so much gravy, which they accept. But there is not enough gravy to pass around.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Illinois base his argument on the premise that farmers, wealthy or poor, do not use this money in fact for actual soil conservation, but take it for purposes which do not in fact save the soil?

Mr. DOUGLAS. My point is that the well-educated and prosperous farmer will engage in such practices anyway, just as a prosperous and well-educated parent will see to it that his children get orange juice or tomato juice and have their teeth taken care of. In order to make sure that their children shall have orange juice or tomato juice, and shall have straight teeth, should the Government be called upon to send dentists and dietitians into every American home to see to it that at breakfast the children have a glass of orange juice? It is a consummation devoutly to be wished, but does it follow that we must make bonus payments to prosperous families in order to insure that orange juice will be drunk and that teeth will be straightened?

I am in favor of dental clinics and school lunches for the children who really need them. I do object to an all-powerful state going into farms and homes which are able to make the decisions for themselves, and, under the guise of money payments, get them to make such decisions. There are some situations with respect to which we should permit individual judgment to prevail. The state should not blow the nose of every child that has a cold.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. I believe the Senator's dental analogy is exceedingly fallacious when applied to the matter of soil conservation. After all, the individual to whom he refers owns his teeth, and he can do with them what he wants. If he has the money he can have his teeth repaired. If he does not want to have his teeth repaired, it is his affair.

We are dealing with a basic national interest, which I believe the Senator from Illinois is overlooking and discarding on the assumption that, because a man who presently has title in a farm, he has enough money for soil conservation if he wants to spend it for soil conservation, and therefore the Federal Government should pay no attention to the problem. I wish to point out that all of us have a great national interest in farm properties. I rather look upon the holders of American farms, although they have legal title to them, I admit, as holding, after all, a great trust for posterity.

So it seems to me that the basic question is whether, in fact, a sound soil-conservation program will be conducted to preserve the topsoil of the United States if we do not have the National Government take an interest in this kind of a program.

Of course, in this connection we have experience to go by. The contention of the Senator from Illinois that simply because the present titleholder of a farm has enough money to be able to carry on a soil-conservation program, ipso facto he will carry it on, is not in accord with the facts. The farm owners have not done that. All that we have to do in order to ascertain that situation is examine the record of the soil-conservation program of the United States. By doing so, we find that those who conduct that program are dealing not only with the marginal farms. I can take the Senator from Illinois to some fertile areas in this country and show him that some of the large farm operators there are not engaging in soil-conservation practices.

Mr. President, history shows that whenever a nation begins losing its topsoil its civilization over the centuries declines. So in this case we are dealing with a historic problem.

In the year 1951, on the basis of an argument which I say most respectfully to the Senator from Illinois is a fallacious one and one in favor of false economy, I do not think we should make the kind of saving the Senator from Illinois proposes by way of adopting his amendment to the committee amendment, which I think will really sacrifice thousands upon thousands of tons of the precious topsoil of the land of America.

I favor a soil-conservation program, and I think the Senator from Illinois should be pleading for an increase in the appropriation, not a reduction in it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I did not know whether the Senator from Oregon was going to ask me a question or was going to make a statement. I thought I was yielding for a question, but I have been very glad to have him make a statement.

The Senator from Oregon has made a very eloquent plea about topsoil, and he has pointed out that it is a national asset. Of course that is true. Health is also a national asset, and is just as precious an asset as is topsoil, and yet we are not providing bonus payments to parents if they provide the right foods and health protection for their children.

In all these things, the question is how much will the State do and how much shall we allow the individual to do? It is a very difficult decision to make. Some of us draw the line at some places, and others draw the line at other places.

Some persons say that the Federal Government should not concern itself at all with health. I do not agree. However, neither do I agree with those who say that the Federal Government should go into every household and should take care of the health of every family. I think that in the main we should rely upon individual choice, and we should have the Federal Government and the State governments in reserve in cases where, either because of lack of knowledge or foresight or lack of funds, health is not properly conserved.

The same is true in the case of soil. Is it not desirable in the main that the farmers should do these things for themselves if they are able to do them, if they have sufficient funds with which to do them, if they have the will to do them, and if they wish to do them? Under those circumstances, it is much better to have the decisions made by the individuals, rather than by the Government, but holding the Government in reserve in cases where farmers, either because of poverty or lack of knowledge or indifference, allow their soil to become depleted and allow erosion to occur.

That is really the issue between us, it seems to me.

Mr. President, I believe that the formula now included, and which with the amendment to the committee amendment will become even more flexible, will permit the Department of Agriculture to use this appropriation in the areas where the money is most needed and where the soil is most depleted, and will permit the Department to take the money away from the great areas in the Midwest where the soil is not depleted, but already is rich. This proposal will permit the Department to concentrate the money on the farms which need to engage in desirable agricultural practices, instead of spreading the money between all farms, regardless of need.

The argument of my colleague and of myself is, I think, that a very considerable proportion of the farmers of the United States will put these practices into effect, regardless of whether or not the Federal Government makes these subsidy payments. Those farmers would engage in those practices as a matter of good farming, on the basis of the knowlelge and the income and the technical assistance they have. They would engage in those practices anyway. In those cases, we do not believe the Federal Government should give these added amounts, which will constitute subsidies and will come either directly from the taxpayers or from the community as a whole, trough inflation. We believe that approximately half of the funds should be used to carry on this program for those who need the services, but not for those who do not need the services.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the pending amendment, I rise in support of the proposed reduction of $130,000,000.

Much has been said about how the appropriations are being cut. The committee report now before us indicates that the bill as it now stands provides for a cut, as compared with last year's appropriations, of $24,429,570.

I have a great deal of respect for the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the chairman of the subcommittee, and for the Appropriations Committee as a whole. However, I wish to repeat—and I think the Senator from Georgia will agree with me—that the report is in error, in that the bill does not represent any decrease in the appropriations, as compared with the actual appropriations made last year.

Instead of a saving of $24,000,000, as is claimed in the report, I point out that the bill now before us actually represents an increase in the amount of $335,871,973 over the appropriations made for these purposes last year. In other words, if the bill as reported by the committee is enacted, without the acceptance of any of the amendments, the bill will authorize expenditures of over $1,000,000,000 in this one Department alone, insofar as the American taxpayers are concerned.

This discrepancy in the committee's figures is accounted for on page 52 of the bill, wherein the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury by canceling notes issued by that Corporation in the amount of $427,000,000. This represents a restoration of the capital impairment as a result of losses sustained by that Corporation on its food destruction or give-away program.

Last year these note cancellations amounted to $66,698,457, which amount was canceled on September 6, 1950.

I think the Senator from Georgia will agree with me that these note cancellations, as far as the American taxpayers are concerned, fall in the same category as the cash appropriations provided by this bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course I agree that it is money which comes out of the Treasury, but I think it occupies an entirely different position from cash appropriations made in the bill.

In all frankness, Mr. President, I think the Senator from Delaware is making a rather far-fetched argument when he says that the cancellation of the notes amounts to the same thing as an appropriation made in this bill. I make that statement for the reason that the cancellations are made in accordance with an act passed by the Congress. In my judgment, the cancellation of these notes is similar to the action taken in carrying out the international wheat agreement, in connection with which we are compelled to cancel $76,000,000 worth of notes in a year. I believe that operation occupies an entirely different position from the soil-conservation programs.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am not speaking of the soil-conservation programs; I am speaking of the over-all appropriations provided for in this bill.

The note cancellations for the International Wheat Agreement are authorized in another section of the bill. While it is true that the cancellation of the notes issued by the Commodity Credit Corporation is done in carrying out of the provisions of another section of the law, yet I point out that so far as the American taxpayers are concerned, the agricultural program this year, when this bill is enacted, if it is enacted in the form in which it has been reported, will call for expenditures of more than $1,000,000,000 for the Department of Agriculture alone, and not for expenditures of $751,770,130, as stated in the committee report.

The fact that the notes of the Commodity Credit Corporation are canceled must be taken into consideration when we pass a tax bill and also when we count up the over-all expenditures of the Government. I think the Senator from Georgia will agree as to that.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, I agree that when we consider the fiscal burden on the taxpayers, the ECA expenditures and commitments and all other expenditures and commitments must be taken into consideration, for all of them are obligations on the Treasury of the United States. What I complained of was that the Senator from Delaware was saying that they occupied the same status as appropriations for agriculture contained in this bill. That is a part of his statement with which I heartily disagree. I do not agree with that conclusion.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not often find myself in disagreement with the Senator from Georgia, but, on that point, I do disagree, because the cancellation of these notes is directly as a result of the agriculture program; because there is a loss sustained by the Corporation on the agricultural program, and it does represent expenditures as far as that program is concerned. The fact that they are so recognized by the Appropriations Committees and by the Congress is evidenced by the fact that these cancellation authorizations always fall into this appropriation bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot speak for the Congress or for the committees, or for all those who are interested; but I am quite sure that the Committee on Appropriations would not agree with the Senator's conclusion that these cancellations occupy the same relationship to the agriculture program as do the appropriations contained in this bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know whether I am misinformed on the matter or not, but, as I remember the old law, there is a requirement that, when the stock of the Commodity Credit Corporation is impaired, it must be reported to the Treasury, the Treasury reports it to the Congress, and it becomes necessary for the Congress to repair the capital stock structure. The impairment, of course, is the amount which the Commodity Credit Corporation loses on its various farm prices.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is, on its over-all program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Including the food shipped under ECA, and everything else.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That could be; but the fact of the matter is that most of that is in the field of surplus export, and there is authority for that in the agricultural bills; so that I believe the Senator from Delaware is very substantially correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the Senator from Illinois is entitled to his opinion, but the Senator from Delaware has said that he thought I would agree with him. I do not agree with him that cancellations amount to the same thing as the appropriations of this bill. I have great respect for the Senator from Delaware. Of course, I think I correctly quote him, in connection with the appropriation, as saying that the cancellations have the same relationship to agriculture as the appropriations contained in this bill; but that does not appeal to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Again I point out to the Senator from Georgia that I cannot agree with his conclusions. I regret it. The ECA program, referring particularly to the shipments under it of agricultural products is provided for by the Congress, under a separate appropriation bill. Money is taken from that appropriation and paid over into the Commodity Credit Corporation, and it has no relationship whatever to this $427,000,000 loss. The Commodity Credit Corporation does not merely allocate these commodities to ECA, and charge them off as losses. They get paid for all they sell to the ECA program. I know the Senator from Georgia will agree with me on that.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I do not altogether agree with the Senator from Delaware on that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator will agree with me that the ECA appropriation pays for its own purchases, will he not?

Mr. RUSSELL. It does.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It certainly does.

Mr. RUSSELL. The ECA appropriation pays for whatever is paid for out of the ECA appropriation; but some of the items represent losses, which are incurred by virtue of the fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation sells to ECA at less than cost; and it is not all in this country. We have a program in Mexico in connection with the hoof and mouth disease eradication there, under which we undertake to buy so many millions of pounds of canned meat, at a certain cost, in Mexico. Those meats are purchased out of Commodity Credit Corporation funds. They are sold later to England and to other countries at considerably less than we paid for them. I do not think that item can fairly be charged to American agriculture, at least to the same extent that a soil-conservation program would be.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Senator will yield, I think that point is correct, except that those are very, very modest amounts, indeed.

Mr. RUSSELL. A sum of approximately $30,000,000 is not very modest, I should say.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But what the Senator from Delaware says is, in my judgment, very substantially correct.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will yield in a moment. The amount which was spent as a result of the Mexican canned-meat program was insignificant in comparison to the over-all loss of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I will yield to the Senator from North Dakota in a moment. But I first want to point out to the Senator from Georgia that, though this loss was not sustained on ECA programs, it represents losses on the many agricultural commodities which have been declared surplus, destroyed, or given away in the past 12 months by this administration. It represents the potatoes which have been dumped into heaps, to be burned or otherwise destroyed, or put into hog lots. It represents the raisins or the money which the Government spent on raisins which were sold to the farmers in California, that they might feed them to the hogs. It represents all of the other foolish food destruction programs of this administration in the past several months, and it represents 100 percent the expenditures of the Agricultural Department. Whether these programs are justified, whether this administration is justified in destroying this food while we are at war, or whether it was justified in destroying it before we got into war, is another point. I merely point out that the cost of the agricultural program today, when this bill passes, assuming there is no reduction made, will be, as far as the American taxpayer is concerned—and that is what he is interested in, what he is going to have to pay—will be $1,081,000,000. He is going to pay the money for every dime of note cancellations in the Treasury, whether it is appropriated in cash and paid over to the Treasury, or whether the notes are merely canceled, as is proposed. It is immaterial to the American people who have to pay the bill how this is handled.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I shall not debate with the Senator from Delaware the merits of the potato program and other programs. I have heard the Senator wax very eloquent on that point, and I concede that that program was very poorly handled. I would be the last to praise the Agricultural Department for the way it handled the details of that program, but I do take the position that there are many details and very substantial items involved. As I recall, the Senator stated there was a loss to the CCC of more than $30,000,000 on the Mexican canned-meat program. I consider that to be quite a substantial sum of money. It is, in my State, perhaps not in those States where the Senators insist upon the farmers' refrain from receiving soil-conservation checks; but, in some sections of the country, $30,000,000, plus, is still a considerable amount of money. I do not think such an item is chargeable against agriculture to the same extent as is an action program. That is the difference between the Senator from Delaware and me. I did not intend to interrupt him, until he said he thought I would agree that that is as much to be charged against the agricultural program as any other item of the bill. That is a statement with which I disagree. The Senator is correct, of course, in saying that this meant that the losses, of one kind and another, incurred by the Commodity Credit Corporation, are being charged off in this bill. There can be no question about that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And, so far as the American taxpayer, which includes the American farmer, is concerned, it is immaterial whether it is handled in the form of note cancellations or of direct appropriations, is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. So far as the American taxpayer is concerned, whether it is done by appropriation or whether it is done by note cancellations, the result is that the American taxpayer, at some time and place, is going to be compelled to pay. But that is an entirely different condition, in my opinion, from an out-of-pocket appropriation for agriculture.

Mr. WILLIAMS. So now the Senator will agree with me, then, that as far as the American taxpayers are concerned, instead of taking this report at face value indicating a saving of $24,000,000, when we get through with this bill, assuming it is passed without amendment, they will really be $335,000,000 worse off than they were a year ago, in the same appropriation bill; will they not?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I do not agree to that, because I do not recall exactly the amounts which have been cancelled. I know that, when we had food subsidies during the late war, we cancelled $700,000,000 or $800,000,000 of Commodity Credit Corporation notes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am speaking of this year. What happened in World War II has nothing to do with this bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not recall the amount of Commodity Credit Corporation notes cancelled last year, or whether any of them were cancelled last year, but if they were, I think it was done by a supplemental bill, not in the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I may point out to the Senator from Georgia that on page 438 of this year's 1952 budget, it specifically states that $66,698,457 was approved for cancellation, or restoration of capital, in the last fiscal year, and I say again that it does have a direct connection.

Unless we make some cuts in this bill we will have increased last year's appropriation by over $300,000,000 in this bill alone. If we go on in the same way we shall end up without having accomplished any economy at all.

I know of no stronger encouragement that could be presented in favor of this reduction than to read from a telegram received yesterday from Roger Fleming, secretary-treasurer of the American Farm Bureau Federation, in which he speaks on behalf of the federation, endorsing the $130,000,000 cut. The telegram reads as follows:

> Reduction of Federal expenditures absolutely essential part sound inflation control program. Welfare of all citizens, farmers included, placed in jeopardy unless basic causes of inflation are checked. Farmers are willing to do their fair share toward accomplishing this objective. Statement on behalf of American Farm Bureau Federation mailed you July 18 contains recommendations, with particular reference agricultural appropriations. Especially urge your support reducing agricultural conservation payments authorization for 1952 crop program to $150,000,000.

When testifying before the Senate Appropriations Committee, Mr. Allan B. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, endorsed the cut, and said:

> The best place possible to demonstrate our sincerity is right in this program and we believe that in a great many areas this thing can be so managed that the $150,000,000 will match the needs. This is a real saving, of course, as far as that program is concerned.

I also pointed out earlier today that when testifying before the Finance Committee Mr. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and Mr. Newsom, master of the National Grange, said that the most constructive thing we could do would be to approve this cut. Mr. Newsom said, further, that there was no justification for payments to individual farmers under present income positions.

The whole program was started in the depression and the agency is a depression-born agency. It has been carried over into a period of prosperity, and now, even with the enthusiastic endorsement of practically every farm organization in the country with reference to a cut, we still find Congress and the administration fighting any reduction. Apparently they are determined to spend this country into bankruptcy.

A few minutes ago the question was raised that perhaps these endorsements did not spring from the grassroots, and that the American farmers really do not support this amendment. I should like to read a letter which I received today

from Ralph R. Peters, executive secretary, Delaware Farm Bureau. I point again what is often overlooked, that the State which I represent, including the county in which I live, is the third ranking county in agricultural production east of the Rocky Mountains. We outrank any county in the States of Illinois, Georgia, Arizona, or any of the so-called agricultural States of the Midwest and South.

I now read the letter from Mr. Peters, which is dated July 24, 1951:

> Several Farm Bureau community groups have passed resolutions urging your support to reduce ACP payments to $150,000,000 for 1952.
>
> We feel this is necessary if other nonessential Federal expenditures are to be reduced. We don't believe it possible to control inflation and spend as usual for nonessential programs.

I want the Senator from Georgia to pay particular attention to this, because I think he is the one who raised the question that perhaps this is not the general feeling of the farmers in the various areas of the country. I read further:

> All of the groups contacted were unanimous in this opinion and asked that I communicate their feelings in regard to nonessential expenditures of all kinds.

That letter is signed by Ralph R. Peters, executive secretary, Delaware Farm Bureau.

Mr. President, when these gentlemen speak I know they are speaking for the grassroots farmers. In our area of the country, which was established long before any of the areas in the Midwest, long before we ever heard of a New Deal, a Fair Deal, or a "double deal" in Washington, the farmers were practicing soil conservation. They did it without being paid for it. I know they are not dependent upon these payments for their living. They are perfectly willing to give it up in the name of economy provided we cut out all the subsidies like those the junior Senator from Illinois enumerated a few minutes ago.

The American farmers are to be commended upon the fact that when they came before us this year asking us to be a little careful about placing increased taxes on them, and asking us to be a little more careful about spending their money, which has been so recklessly spent in the last few years, each one started out by naming a specific agricultural program upon which they were willing to take a cut. For us now completely to ignore their own recommendation would be about as foolish a step as the Senate has ever taken. If we do ignore it, so far as John Q. Public is concerned, he will have to cough up an extra $355,000,000 over and above what he coughed up 12 months ago, to pay for the extra cost of the agricultural program.

I have expressed my opinion many times with reference to the policy of dumping food into the hog lots, particulary in wartime.

About 20 pages later in the bill some Senator is going to defend the $427,000,000 item to pay for the food that was destroyed last year on the basis we had surpluses. But right now we are told it is necessary to apppropriate $280,000,000 to encourage the farmer to produce more surplus so there will be more food to destroy or feed to the pigs next year. It just does not make sense and the farmers know it. This is a continuation of the Henry Wallace formula of plowing under crops, killing pigs, and everybody living out of the Federal Treasury.

It was argued a few moments ago that a part of the cost of the program was to go for the reseeding of range lands of the Midwest. What is wrong with the farmers in the Midwest reseeding their own ranges? The administration today pleads for the Midwestern farmer who is described as being unable to seed his own grass ranges, yet a few weeks ago they were condemning the cattle grower who uses these ranges as the most selfish profiteering group in the United States. It just does not make sense. The Senate today wants to spend millions to push prices higher, and on the other side of the Capitol Members of the House are dealing with controls because they pity the American housewife, who has to pay such high prices on account of food destroyed. It is little wonder that Washington has been labeled the "Capitol of the State of Confusion."

Everyone knows that we cannot control inflation by merely placing a price-control bill on the books. The American farmers have recognized that if we are sincere in trying to stop inflation we should stop Government spending.

I certainly hope the amendment will be adopted as one step on the road to cutting these appropriations.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the indulgence of the few Senators present to say a few words in opposition to the proposed amendment.

This country cannot at this time let its productive capacity decline, if for only two simple reasons, namely, because of the increase in our population, and because of acreage losses due to erosion and depletion. Our population is now increasing at the rate of 6,000 a day. Even with the splendid progress which has been made in the feld of soil conservation, our productive land is decreasing at the rate of 500,000 acres a year as a result of erosion and depletion. In the early days of our history, when a farmer cleared a small acreage for farming, he cultivated it until the land became exhaused. After that occurred he could move on a few miles away or perhaps a few acres away, and start another farm and work it until the land become depleted. We no longer have such frontiers. Most of our fertile land is now in use. Our cropland acreage available is 460,000,000 acres, and it is all being used. It can readily be seen that with an increase in our population as I have indicated and the yearly decrease in our fertile acres, as I have pointed out, we should by all means save and protect our precious soil.

Today we have a population in excess of 150,000,000. In 1920 the number of cultivated harvested acres per person was 3.3 acres. Today that per capita acreage in harvested acres, in a period of a little more than 30 years, has decreased to 2.2 acres, a drop of 33.3 percent a person.

I do not believe any Member of the Senate will deny the good that has come from soil-conservation practices. Let me give a few instances of the benefits that have come to our productive capacity in the production of food and fiber. The production in 1950 was 40 percent per acre greater than the average for 1935 to 1939, and the goal set for 1951 is 145 percent of the 1935–39 average. Therefore, Mr. President, it goes without saying that in order to be able to produce this vast amount of food which is now needed, we must preserve and protect our precious topsoil. We must encourage the use of modern methods which are the product of research through our Department of Agriculture. In other words, the food and fiber needs per person in the United States are now being met with 33 percent less acres of land per person than in 1920.

I wish to be a little more specific. In 1925 it required nearly 46,000,000 acres to produce 16,000,000 bales of cotton. This year we asked for 28,500,000 acres to produce the same quantity of cotton. Our production may reach seventeen to eighteen million bales. Such an increase will not come along by chance, but no doubt through soil betterment, the intelligent use of fertilizer, and better methods developed through research.

As was pointed out a moment ago by the distinguished Senator from Oregon, this soil belongs to the Nation. It does not belong to the individual who plants and cultivates it. It is the duty of the Nation to protect and preserve this precious soil for the benefit of future generations.

Mr. President, it was my privilege to make a world tour 2 years ago. I visited Iran and Iraq, which now constitutes old Persia. I was very much depressed when traveling over that ancient country. In times past historians tell us that Persia was able to sustain a population of 115,000,000 people. Today it can hardly provide a livelihood for 15,000,000 people.

Let us consider the great valley of Mesopotamia, that is the area of land between the Tigris and the Euphrates, which is now a portion of Iraq. At one time it used to produce sufficient crops of fiber and food to provide for the sustenance of 15,000,000 people. Today it can hardly support the livelihood of 3,000,000 people. Why? One need but visit it to find the answer. The great rivers, the Euphrates and the Tigris, have brought down to the Gulf of Persia the topsoil of that great country to such an extent that there are thousands upon thousands of acres of that land that are now as barren of vegetation as the floor upon which I am standing. Mr. President, I do not want such a calamity to occur in this country.

Last year my distinguished friend, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], tried to and succeeded in reducing many of the appropriations the Committee on Appropriations sought to place in a

bill in order to build various dams in the Missouri Valley.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is the Senator from Louisiana sure about his facts when he says that any of the amendments in question were adopted? My recollection is that those amendments were not adopted.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was last year. Additions were made in the Senate, and, as I remember, the House struck them out.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think any amendments making cuts in the appropriations were adopted on the floor. I think they were all voted down.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may have made a misstatement to some extent. However, I do know that the subcommittee, of which I was a member, placed in the civil-functions bill, and the subcommittee dealing with the Interior Department bill placed in the Interior Department appropriation bill, a good deal of money with which to build dams, but in conference those items were deleted or reduced by action of our good friends on the other side of the Capitol.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct about that. I recall that distinctly.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is a great pity that those distinguished Representatives, as well as some Senators who voted against the appropriations, could not have gone down into the great Missouri Valley and seen with their own eyes what has occurred in the last 3 or 4 weeks.

Mr. President, since these great projects have been authorized, there is no question that if we had spent the money necessary to build the dams the great disaster which occurred in the Missouri Valley would not have happened. General Pick made a statement, which appeared in the press some time ago, that the losses in that great valley will aggregate almost $1,000,000,000. Yet the cost of building the necessary dams and levees that would have averted this tragedy would have been less than $300,000,000. Would that the Congress had the vision to appropriate the money in order to build these dams and levees. The loss of $1,000,000,000 is property loss. It is the loss of physical property, homes, and industries. That property is replaceable. But we cannot replace the billions of tons of topsoil carried down the river. That topsoil cannot be replaced. It is a total loss. I say it is shortsightedness on the part of the Senate to refuse to appropriate enough money to remedy this situation. Such refusal simply represents false economy.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If I correctly understand the Senator from Louisiana, to a certain extent he is attributing the loss in the Missouri Valley to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] who proposes these cuts.

Mr. ELLENDER. No. There are quite a few Senators who advocated the same proposal.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. With respect to the soil-conservation program, as I pointed out a while ago, the population is increasing at the rate of 6,000 persons a day, and our harvested acres are being depleted at the rate of 500,000 acres a year. It is self-evident that unless something is done to prevent soil erosion it will not be long before the conditions which I described as existing in Persia, will soon be with us.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may finish what I started to say?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I merely wish to point out to the Senator from Louisiana, in all fairness to the Senator from Illinois, that I joined him in voting for the cuts, so I take my share of the responsibility, even though my name was not mentioned. We were unsuccessful in our effort to make cuts. We were unsuccessful in cutting the soil-conservation payments last year. They went through in their entirety; and they did not stop the water rolling down the Missouri River to any extent whatever.

Mr. ELLENDER. What made me remember the situation so well was the fact that the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the senior Senator from Delaware fought those appropriations, particularly those with respect to the money sought to be obtained for building levees and spillways from Cairo, Ill., on down to the Gulf.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What I wished to point out was that we were defeated. The money was appropriated, and it still did not stop the water from rolling down. No amount of money which the Government can appropriate can stop the losses sustained from the kind of floods from which Kansas and Missouri recently suffered.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I pointed out last year, the work in the lower valley was authorized in 1928. If the money necessary to put that program through had been appropriated, all the damage which is now occurring from Cairo on down would not have occurred. Last year, the year before that, and the year previous to that, the State of Louisiana was overflowed in part. If this program for the lower valley, which was authorized back in 1928, had been completed, our losses would have been nil. By the same token, we have been delaying or curtailing the appropriations necessary to complete the Missouri Valley projects. I do not mean to say that we could have stopped the damage altogether, but one needs to go down there and see for himself. A couple of dams were built, and all the land below those dams suffered not at all. Tremendous losses occurred where we had failed to build proposed dams. This morning a bird's eye picture of that situation was presented to us before the Appropriations Committee. My good friend from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] made a visit to this area. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] also made a visit there. They saw with their own eyes the good effect which resulted from the building of the dams I have mentioned.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to associate myself with the very constructive presentation being made by the Senator from Louisiana. There is no question in the world that if the contemplated programs were in operation as of today, the serious floods in the Missouri and Kansas Rivers would not have taken place. It is quite true that we cannot appropriate money in this Congress to undo the damage which took place 3 weeks ago. But we cannot start any earlier than now. If we are to offset the damage in future years, we should continue with the whole Missouri River development program as rapidly as engineering and construction science will permit.

In addition to structures in the lower valley, it is essential, as the Senator from Louisiana well knows—and in the past he has consistently supported these projects by his votes—to hold back in the upper reaches of the rivers the flood waters of the spring and the melting snows, so that when floods occur further down they will pour into half-empty channels instead of channels running bank-full.

In this very Congress the House of Representatives deleted from the civil functions bill some very important flood-control dams, two of which happened to be located in my State. One was at Gavins Point. While they are primarily dams to store water, they prevent floods farther downstream.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is there any doubt in the Senator's mind that if the estimates made by the Corps of Engineers as to the amount of money which should be spent each year in order to build the dams had been allowed, those dams would now be constructed?

Mr. MUNDT. There is not the slightest doubt of it. Furthermore, the loss sustained in this one flood would more than pay for the entire river-long, valley-wide flood-control program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Last year the Corps of Engineers asked that $115,000,000 be appropriated in order to continue the flood-control work from Cairo, Ill., to the lower Mississippi. Do Senators know how much we got? It was $62,000,000, or just a little more than 50 percent of the amount requested. This time a little less than $100,000,000 was asked, and the House recommended $59,000,000, or just a little more than half of the amount requested. I say that when a project of that size and importance was authorized in 1928, and today it is only half completed, there is no one to blame for it except the Congress, for not appropriating the money.

By the same token, I am saying that it is a crime to permit such losses to be sustained as have been sustained in the States of Kansas, Missouri, Okla-

homa, and other States. The responsibility can be placed upon the doorstep of Congress.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Since the catastrophe in Missouri and Kansas, I suppose there have been a dozen or 15 speeches made on this floor reproaching the Senate and the House for their sins of omission in not making ample funds available in other years and now. Along with it, of course, goes the old story, that there is nothing but Delphic wisdom in the minds of engineers, and that what they say represents the alpha and the omega.

The fact of the matter is that the junior Senator from Illinois simply does not agree. I believe that my friend from Louisiana will bear me out when I say that when we started with the flood-control program long ago, it was commonly referred to as the Jadwin plan. General Jadwin was then Chief of Army Engineers. I know what his thesis was. I built my share of levees and dug my share of ditches, as a drainage contractor years ago. The idea was to get the water down to the Gulf of Mexico as rapidly as possible. What happened? Up and down the territory in the watersheds the farmers put in tile. The water was drained from the land into the small streams rapidly. The small streams were straightened out so as to get the water rapidly into the larger watercourses, such as the Illinois, the Mississippi, and other rivers.

What happened? The system began to fill up. So we were told, "We must build levees." After a while we were told, "Build them higher." I went down to bid on some work near Vicksburg, Miss., many years ago. The levees were about 50 feet high. The only way to build them was by the use of a train of cars, borrowing dirt from a point 10 miles away.

We have shrunk the watercourses. The Mississippi is a river which builds up, as distinguished from the Orinoco, the Volga, and other rivers. Nature goes across the landscape, there comes high precipitation, the water rises, and there is no place for it to go, so the crown of the levee is knocked off, and the surrounding area inundated.

It seems to me that before we reproach the Congress we had better go back and reexamine the entire flood-control thesis of the Government. It has been only in recent years that we have begun to hear about upstream engineering. I, for one, certainly do not like to be reproached for whatever sins of omission or commission may be laid at my door.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is not my purpose to argue the so-called Jadwin plan with my good friend from Illinois. The fact remains that the proposal now being carried out, snail-like, was adopted by the Congress. I am convinced that if the money had been appropriated at the proper time to carry out the so-called Jadwin plan, as amended from time to time, Louisiana, Arkansas, and other States from Cairo on down to the mouth of the Mississippi would not have been visited with such floods as occured in the last few years.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is true that the river was straightened out from Cairo on to the northern part of my State, but there remains today the floodway which is to be built near Angola, La., at Morganza, La., to take care of the overflow water which comes down the river at greatly accelerated speed. As I recall, the Mississippi River at Angola can carry only a million and a half cubic feet per second, whereas it is estimated that at the highest expected flood over 3,000,000 cubic feet per second pass at that point. In order to take care of the situation, the Morganza floodway was planned.

Ever since I have been in the Senate, and that has been for a period of almost 15 years, I have been asking and begging Congress, through the Appropriations Committee, to appropriate a sufficient sum of money to complete the Morganza floodway. I have no doubt in my mind that if that part of the flood program had been finished we would not be visited with the floods that come to my State, to Arkansas, to other States, and to places like Cairo, as they do each year.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I admit that if we continue to take away the reservoir space, if we build the levees higher, and take the water away from the fish and birds, we must provide additional reservoir space. The only place it can be built is between two levees. In that way we confine the stream. In that way we get on the Mississippi what we have on the other streams. Then there soon comes more water than ever before, and higher floods than have ever before been recorded. The water goes over the levees, and then we begin to shriek like children in the woods.

Mr. ELLENDER. I disagree with my able friend from Illinois. There was evidence adduced before our committee yesterday with respect to the expenditure of money in that regard. During a certain period of time we appropriated $20,000,000 to do certain work on the Missouri River, so as to make the river run in a fixed channel. The work was done piecemeal. Instead of appropriating sufficient money to complete the job, it was done piecemeal. We spread the work over a period of time. We spread it very thinly. It was testified that in the course of a short period over 50 percent of the money that was spent was lost, and we would have to start all over again. All of that loss was sustained, I repeat, because of piecemeal construction. I say that if the plans which had been carefully worked out by our engineers had been put into effect without delay, we would not be faced with that situation. I am satisfied that General Jadwin probably would never have advocated the plan for flood control of the Mississippi if he thought it would require 30 years to accomplish. His idea was that it be done within 10 or 15 years, not 30 years. By the same token I say that the plans which have been authorized by Congress and which are now being worked out piecemeal in the Missouri Valley should have been completed and well under way, instead of having this dilly-dayying by Congress.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I wish to point out to my good friend from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that just as there has been considerable progress made in the past quarter century in the fields of electrical engineering, automotive engineering, and aeronautical engineering, there has also been great progress made in the field of river engineering.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No one can question the fact.

Mr. MUNDT. We are approaching the problem of flood control in a manner considerably different from that in which we approached it a quarter of a century ago, when it was largely a matter of straightening the channel, increasing the height of the levee, and eliminating curves on a river. Today, because Army engineers have learned something from reclamation engineers, and because both of them have learned something from working with nature for several decades, we approach the problem from the standpoint of holding in the upper reaches of the river the freshets which cause the floods. It agrees closely with what the Senator from Louisiana has referred to earlier, namely, the relationship between the soil conservation and flood control.

The whole science of soil conservation is based on retarding the rapidity with which water reaches the channel. The concept which is followed now by the Army engineers under the Pick-Sloan plan, and in the country generally, is to hold up the sources of the influx to the river of water as much as possible, so that it can be regulated down a stream.

I quite agree that Congress cannot assume full responsibility because the science of engineering has improved considerably. Today, under the very able leadership of General Pick, we have made a great forward step from the standpoint of the science of flood control.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I simply make the point that 25 years ago, if we quarreled with one of the engineers, it was like quarreling with the source of all wisdom. The engineers had all the answers. They had the answer to everything. Now comes a confession that they did not have the answer to everything.

I only say that at this stage of the proceeding, being confronted with the catastrophe in Kansas and Missouri, it may be to the interest of everyone concerned to reexamine some of the basic theses under which we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars, with much of the money being wasted.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me say at this point, for the information of my good friend from Illinois, that this morning, during the hearing before the Subcommittee on Civil Functions of the Army, we asked the representative of General Pick—General Pick could not be present—whether or not it was contemplated to make any changes in the prior

plans, in view of the disaster in the Missouri Valley, and the answer was in the negative. It was stated that the plans had been worked out and that they would have done the job if only the dams had been built.

All of this work goes hand in hand with the soil-conservation work we are now talking about. If we can retard the flow of water at its source, from the little rivulets and streams into the large rivers, we will accomplish our purposes. What we are most concerned with at the present time is to do and to continue to do what will protect and preserve for future generations the precious top soil of our country.

Mr. President, I did not intend to discuss the flood-control program. However, I wish to repeat, by way of emphasis, that if we curtail the amount of money for soil conservation as was done during the Eightieth Congress, there is no question in my mind that the program will suffer considerably.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator from Louisiana mean to imply that the program was curtailed during the Eightieth Congress?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; in 1948.

Mr. WHERRY. How does the Senator explain the fact that the President of the United States impounded about $80,000,000 which Congress had appropriated, and would not let it be spent? I have been a member of the committee since I came to Congress. It is true that the Eightieth Congress did set a good record for economy, but in this instance the difficulty arose from the President's impounding $80,000,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think my friend is in error, but irrespective of who did it, it came to pass. The point I wish to make to my distinguished friend from Nebraska is that instead of spending $225,000,000 in 1948, only $150,000,000 was spent. What was the result? The number of farms participating dropped 16 percent, and the number of individuals following the practices dropped 27 percent. That was in 1 year. If the program had continued to be curtailed from year to year it would not have taken very long for the entire program to be stopped entirely.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to correct my statement. Is the Senator talking about soil conservation?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I thought the Senator was talking about flood control a moment ago.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am talking now about soil conservation.

Mr. WHERRY. I understood the Senator to be discussing flood control.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was drawn into the discussion, I may say to my distinguished friend from Nebraska. As is often the case, we speak about one subject, as I was speaking about soil conservation, and we are drawn into another subject. I did not mind it, however.

Mr. WHERRY. I was drawn into the discussion too. I wish the RECORD to show that what I was talking about was the impounding by the President during the Eightieth Congress of the funds appropriated for the flood control purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The information which I have before me shows that the Eightieth Congress cut the appropriation for soil conservation from $225,000,000 to $150,000,000. If that same process had been followed from year to year, the soil conservation program would not amount to anything today.

Mr. President, this program certainly has increased agricultural production in unprecedented amounts. As I pointed out a while ago, I say to the Senator from Alabama, in 1950 agricultural production was increased by 40 percent over the average production in the period from 1935 to 1939. That did not simply happen, but it occurred because of the soil conservation program, the research program, contouring, and other practices. They were what caused that tremendous increase in productivity.

In 1925, as I stated a while ago, 46,000,000 acres of land were required to produce 16,000,000 bales of cotton. Today, 29,000,000 acres of land will produce probably 17,000,000 bales of cotton. That change has not occurred just by chance. I say it is due to the practices which have been carried on through the soil-conservation program, the research program, fertilization, contouring, and other practices. All of them, when added together, caused that great increase in productivity. The feed and fiber needs of the people of the United States are now being met with 33 percent less acres of land per person than in 1920.

Mr. President, I repeat that with our population increasing at the rate of 6,000 additional persons every day, and with a loss in our fertile acreage at the rate of 500,000 acres a year, we cannot afford not to spend the necessary funds in order to preserve and conserve our precious topsoil for future generations.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am as anxious to save money as is anyone else. However, I feel compelled to vote against the Dirksen-Douglas amendment to the committee amendment, because I think it would be short-sighted and, in the long run, would be extremely wasteful if we were to reduce the appropriations for soil conservation.

Among the many responsibilities of government, it seems to me that four stand out as possibly the most important. They are the following: First, to protect our country against attack, insurrection, or subversion; second, to maintain and improve the health of the people of our country; third, to conserve the civil and human rights of our people; fourth, and finally, but by no means the least important, the duty of protecting our natural resources, so that we can hand to our children and to the many generations which will follow them, a country unimpaired in its magnificent physical strength and in its unlimited possibilities.

In New York we have recognized that government responsibility and obligation; and we have been spending, and are spending today—and our work has gone on over a long period of years—large sums of money for reforestation, for flood control, and in the fight against insect pests and blights. That work in New York State has paid. Many of our depleted forests are again flourishing. Soil which had commenced seriously to erode is now being rebuilt into valuable topsoil. Floods are being prevented. We are again among the great agricultural States of the Union.

Mr. President, I do not think I need draw on my theoretical knowledge of the evils, dangers, wastefulness, and extravagance of permitting a rich country to erode. I think many of my colleagues have seen the same things that I have seen; but possibly because of the work in which I was engaged, the impact upon me was greater than it was upon many other persons. In my work as Director General of UNRRA, Mr. President, I visited a great many of the countries of southern Europe and of the Middle East. I saw the result of erosion in Greece, a country which at one time was rich, powerful, and flourishing, not only in the arts and sciences, but also in material wealth.

I visited Yugoslavia, and there again I saw the effects of erosion on the people and on the land. What was originally a great area of rich, fertile agricultural land, with mountains to the east and west and south, has now been eroded to such an extent that it barely suffices to support a few goats and mountain sheep.

I visited Israel, from which my ancestors sprang. That country, once a rich, flourishing, and happy land, with great forests and rivers, rich farms, and other great natural and agricultural resources, a model for the world, and truly one of the garden spots on the face of the earth, has changed tragically. Twenty years ago, after centuries of neglect, the mountains and hills and valleys of Israel had become so eroded the forests so completely destroyed that life for any great number of people with peace and security was impossible.

I visited southern Italy. That land, too, was once prosperous, healthy, and happy. However, today, again because of centuries of neglect, the land has become so eroded that life there is extremely difficult.

Mr. President, I think nothing is more important than that we make certain that our country, of which we are so proud, and which today is the most powerful and prosperous in the world, a Nation of peace-loving idealists, does not lose it heritage, but awakens to the necessity of preserving its great resources, which we have the obligation of passing on to our children.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall vote against the amendment of the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment, because I think it would not result in true economy but, on the contrary, would result in extravagance, loss, and waste. I think the Senator's amendment to the committee amendment is shortsighted and contrary to the larger interests of our country.

So, Mr. President, I very much hope that the amendment of the junior Sena-

tor from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to the committee amendment, will be rejected.

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the question of erosion, which has been discussed, has many facets. Erosion of the fertile soil of a nation is most serious. Erosion of the moral qualities of a people is more serious, and by means of such erosion we can lose great values, different but of equal importance, as compared with the value of top soil.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, Mr. President; and I have yielded to the Senator from Wisconsin.

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to speak for a few minutes on another subject.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY BILL SHOULD AND MUST PASS THIS SESSION

Mr. President, the eyes of the Nation will be on the House Public Works Committee tomorrow when it takes up at long last its final decision on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway bill. The eyes of the Midwest in particular will be on the 25 members of that committee because upon their decision hinges the following:

A. The very economic life and prosperity of the 50,000,000 people in the valley of the Great Lakes and the scores of millions more who will live in this heart of America in generations to come.

B. The welfare of the people in the northeastern section of this country who are desperate for seaway electric power. Electricity is the key to modern industry and the key to national defense. Without sufficient electric "juice," the Northeast will suffer in times to come a worse power famine than she experienced during World War II when northeastern industries had to actually close down factories because of the electrical shortage.

C. The whole future of Canadian-American relations.

D. The entire defense of America which depends upon an alternate transportation artery in view of the fact that the railroads even now are jammed to capacity, as are our present ports.

As the ranking Republican on the Foreign Relations Committee I have pointed out to my colleagues that this Congress has been quick to vote billions for foreign aid. Tomorrow the Foreign Relations Committee begins its hearing on an $8,500,000,000 foreign-aid program. During the past several years the Congress has voted several billions of dollars for public works in every section of this country. In the present Congress it authorized the three-fourths billion dollar central Arizona project, and so the story goes. Billions for Europe, billions for Asia, billions for every section of this country, but not a dime for a self-liquidating project like the St. Lawrence seaway.

We of the Midwest have rarely come to Uncle Sam asking for a penny for rivers and harbors or other public-works projects. We are not asking for a dime now as a gift. We are asking simply for a loan which will be repaid by power tolls and electricity charges.

Senators who have studied this subject know that the best men in the Nation, men like Wilson and others, changed their entire concept as to the need of the St. Lawrence seaway. They came to realize its necessity for the purpose of maintaining the very life of this country, in order that we may get the ore from the Labrador region into the great mills of the Middle West.

The great tragedy of this situation is that our good neighbor to the north, Canada, which has built far larger a proportion of the project than we have even though her resources are far more limited than ours, has announced reluctantly but sternly that unless we of this Congress approve the project, Canada will have to go it alone. I want to say that if we fail in this instance, those who fail this country will live to regret it.

What would it mean if Canada should do as she has suggested? It would mean that Canada would shoulder the entire tremendous cost of the project. It would mean that American ships would have to utilize in effect a foreign transportation artery rather than have the equivalent of our own Panama Canal to the north.

It is our hope and prayer that Canada and the United States, which have been joined in war and peace as the finest example of friendly allies in the world, will be able to shoulder this responsibility together. It will not be a burden. If we get even 20,000,000 tons of ore from Labrador a year, at a toll charge of $1 a ton, we shall be able to more than take care of the overhead, which includes the cost of the investment, and it will be a self-liquidating project.

If it were possible to make the project entirely a matter of public financing, it could be financed overnight; but in view of its being a two-nation project, it is found necessary to proceed in the manner set forth in the measure which I trust will be reported by the committee of the House tomorrow.

I respectfully urge and plead, therefore, that the members of the House Public Works Committee forget everything except the great public need of the hour, that they forget any selfish prejudices, that they forget the pressures on the part of railroad groups of the East and of the South, that they forget the blind fears which have been presented to them, and think only of the national interest and the future of this country. A vote for the seaway is a vote of faith and confidence in America. A vote against the seaway is a blow not only to America, but to our finest ally, a neighbor, who now says that if we do not proceed, she will proceed on her own. That would be a blow to generations which will follow.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall be very glad to yield so that the Senator from Texas may ask the Senator from Wisconsin a question.

Mr. CONNALLY. How many months of the year will the St. Lawrence River be frozen so that ships cannot go through it?

Mr. WILEY. Of course, that is the old argument.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is not an argument; I am asking a question.

Mr. WILEY. Let me answer.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator will.

Mr. WILEY. That is the old argument. A few weeks ago I was at Mackinaw. The Mackinac Channel, in northern Michigan—if the Senator will listen to this—during the 6 months that it is open, carries more tonnage in the channel than all the seaports of the United States combined. Therefore the issue is not how many months is the channel frozen. A few years ago we were told that the iron range would be exhausted within 5 or 10 years. At that time we were taking 80,000,000 tons of ore from the iron range. Today we are taking more than 100,000,000 tons. Next year, if we get into any kind of trouble, we might take 120,000,000 tons. That means that within 5 years all the iron ore in the range will have been exhausted. Already iron ore is being developed in Labrador from which we will be able to get at least from 30,000,000 to 40,000,000 tons a year if this great artery is opened up. I know it is claimed by some that for 6 months a portion of this great artery of commerce might be closed; but, when I say that in the little channel in northern Michigan to which I have referred more tonnage is moved in 6 months than in the ports of New York, San Francisco, New Orleans, the ports of the State of the Senator from Texas, and all others combined, it gives an idea of the situation, and of the amount of ore which can be handled during a period of 6 months.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not inquiring about Mackinac Island or Mackinac freight; I am asking about the St. Lawrence. How many months of the year will it be frozen up so that ships cannot move through it? The Senator knows. Why does he not tell us?

Mr. WILEY. I have told the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; the Senator has not told me that.

Mr. WILEY. I have told the Senator that, in my opinion, traffic from Montreal through that portion of the St. Lawrence will be closed during 4 or 5 months, when it would probably be frozen.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is an answer. I am glad the Senator got around to it.

Mr. WILEY. I am glad the Senator asked it; but I am really surprised that a man of his stature would be so influenced by the Texas viewpoint, a State which has obtained millions and millions of dollars from the United States for its ports, that now, when we seek aid to build a great artery which is necessary for national defense, he should bring up the same old argument, that the St. Lawrence is frozen and impassable during a part of the year. This is the height of provincialism.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator for saying that I have been looking after the interests of Texas. I have been trying to represent the interests of Texas and those of the United States. But when the Senator speaks of a great artery, when that artery is frozen for 6 months in the year and during that time cannot carry any commerce, it is quite a different propostion.

Mr. WILEY. Apparently the Senator does not want to understand when I tell him that in 6 months the tonnage passing through one strait is greater than that which goes into the ports of Texas, New York, and the west coast, all put together. The Senator apparently does not understand the significance of my statement or does he?

Mr. CONNALLY. If we could, during the 6 months, transfer the traffic from the St. Lawrence and put it at Mackinac Island, it would be all right; but all the traffic frozen for 6 months in the year could not be lifted into a warm-water point such as Mackinac Island. I have been to that island. People go there for vacations. But that is not the question. I do not want to spend Government money to dig a canal that will be frozen 6 months in the year and cannot be used. All that can be done with it is to cut the ice, and by the time it is cut it will be frozen again.

Mr. WILEY. It is evident the Senator will not understand. Through the channel at Mackinac come the ore and the shipping that go into Lake Michigan, to the Michigan Lake ports, and into the other ports on Lakes Erie and Ontario, and that one channel alone, during 6 months of the year, carries more traffic, I repeat, than do New York Harbor and the other ports which I have enumerated, combined.

If the ore cannot be obtained in northern Minnesota, where will it come from? The point is that when it is exhausted in Minnesota, it will come from Labrador, via the St. Lawrence, through the lakes, and to the great cities which are now the great manufacturing centers of America.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator how much the project will cost?

Mr. WILEY. The latest figures have not been produced, but I can say that outside the electrical investment the total cost for the Canadian Government and the American Government probably would not be over $600,000,000. A toll of at least $30,000,000 a year would be derived from the ore that would come from Labrador.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Of the $600,000,000, how much would be paid by the United States?

Mr. WILEY. I do not have the exact figures before me. I would say that in view of Canada's investment we probably would pay $400,000,000. That is an approximation.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. If Canada is going to go ahead and finish the project without our help, why should we have to pay such a large proportion of the cost of the project?

Mr. WILEY. The Senator is now raising questions which have been answered in previous arguments. Canada has made an improvement costing in excess of $100,000,000 more than we have expended. The testimony is all in the hearings. I did not intend to be catachised today. I introduced the subject because tomorrow the House will either kill the bill for this session or approve it.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Senator from Maryland hopes the House will kill it.

Mr. WILEY. I realize that. The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] recognizes the significance of what it would mean to our national defense and to the vitality of the Nation. Even Mr. Wilson who, a couple of years ago, was blind to the great national need of this canal, now says the project is imperatively necessary, or the United States will become a second-class Nation.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I was not on the floor at the beginning of this colloquy. I am very glad to support the views expressed by the Senator from Wisconsin. As he knows, I was one of the authors of the bill that would make possible the dual project, the seaway and the great power development——

Mr. WILEY. Which is very important.

Mr. LEHMAN. Which is tremendously important.

I want to say in reply to the Senator from Maryland that the plan is opposed very largely by the railroads and power interests of the country. They feel it is going to hurt their business. I can say to him that every great waterway that has been projected in the last half a century or longer was fought mercilessly and the claim was made that the railroad companies, and the ports that are now handling all the business would suffer.

The Panama Canal was objected to. The same was true a hundred and more years ago with respect to the New York barge canal which connects the Hudson River and Lake Erie.

I think the senior Senator from Texas will remember that at the time the canal was projected in Texas, connecting, I believe, Galveston and Houston, there was great objection to it. It has proved a great asset to both cities and to the State of Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Port of Galveston and the Port of Houston paid for it, very largely.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad the Senator has brought that up.

Mr. CONNALLY. That canal is not frozen up 6 months in the year, either.

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say, with great respect, to the Senator from Texas, that it is estimated that the seaway will carry 60,000,000 or 70,000,000 tons of freight, a large part of which will come from Labrador, being iron ore which is tremendously important in the manufacture of the utensils of war and in the manufacture of utensils used in peaceful operations in this country. It is estimated that the tolls will not only pay the administration costs, the amortization charges, the debt service on the investment, but will leave a very handsome return.

So far as the power is concerned, which is proposed to be developed simultaneously with the seaway and virtually as one operation, while I insist that it be publicly owned, publicly operated, and under public control, it would be an investment that any private banker or any private capitalist would jump at even though rates will be greatly reduced.

I believe the cost could be fully liquidated within a period of 10, 15, or, at the most, 20 years and possibly considerably sooner.

We know that the iron ore in the great Mesabi Range in Minnesota is being depleted. That rich ore has a remaining life of not more than 12 years. We can bring ore from Labrador and get it to the great ports of the Middle West and to many great cities, including Pittsburgh, through an inland passage, not subject to enemy attack as is the case in bringing ore from Latin-American countries or from other parts of the world.

The President, our military leaders, our statesmen, and virtually every man in the Government who has studied defense, or the economic needs of this country, has appeared before the committee and favored the authorization of this great project. I am glad the Senator from Wisconsin brought up the subject.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I concur in all the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] have said about the necessity for developing the navigation on the St. Lawrence seaway. I should like to point out a situation which is equally critical, however. I have inquired as to the power situation in this country, and particularly with reference to the northeastern part of the United States. Mr. Wilson's office furnished me with the information finally that I insisted upon receiving. His office also advised me that it was top-secret information and should not be released.

The power situation in the United States today is so critical that it has to be labeled "top secret." It is just as critical as the status of the strength of our Air Force. The other day there was considerable commotion because, it was said, a couple of Members of Congress divulged the strength of certain types of our airplanes to the world, to potential enemy countries, if you please. I understand that the same Members of Congress who divulged the strength of our Air Force are fighting tooth and nail against the development of the St. Lawrence seaway, which would produce the power to strengthen our Air Force.

Mr. President, it is absolutely necessary that we obtain the power which can be secured through development of the St. Lawrence seaway. It is strange to see that those who express concern over the critical situation we face respecting the strength of our Air Force should be opposing those things which will make the Nation strong.

Russia is developing her power and her waterways with as great speed as

she can. She is developing thousands of miles of waterways, which cannot be destroyed by bombing. She is developing millions of kilowatts of electrical energy to run the factory wheels and develop the minerals of her country. Yet here we find that men who profess to be good loyal Americans are fighting tooth and nail against the development of those resources which affects the very security of their own country.

Representatives of railroads have talked to Members of Congress asking them to oppose the St. Lawrence seaway. The railroads know that they would not be hurt by such development, and they have proved that they know it, when one of their champions in the House inserts an article, I believe in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which says "Let Canada do it. We have no objection to Canada developing the waterway." Well, if the railroads of this country would be hurt by our developing the St. Lawrence seaway they would be just as much hurt if Canada did so.

Mr. President, it is the power interests who are fighting against the proposed development. It is not transportation that is opposed to the development; it is power that is opposed to it. The stakes are over $500,000,000 a year, which the power companies of New England and New York are taking from the people of those States over and above the amount those people would have to pay for power at TVA rates. That is what they are fighting for. The power interests are using the railroads and anyone else they can as fronts. It is simply inconceivable that in this time of dire necessity, when the power situation of America is such that it cannot be divulged, and is labeled top secret, men who profess to be good, loyal American citizens are fighting those developments which will insure the security of their own country.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 367) for the relief of Kay Adel Snedeker, and it was signed by the Vice President.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 25, 1951, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 259. An act to fix the responsibilities of the Disbursing Officer and of the Auditor of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 260. An act to make cancer and all malignant neoplastic diseases reportable to the Director of Public Health of the District of Columbia;

S. 261. An act to amend section 7 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902;

S. 262. An act to amend section 3 of an act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims and suits against the District of Columbia, approved February 11, 1929, and for other purposes;

S. 263. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the apprehension and detention of insane persons in the District of Columbia, and providing for their temporary commitment in the Government Hospital for the Insane, and for other purposes," approved April 27, 1904, as amended;

S. 367. An act for the relief of Kay Adel Snedeker;

S. 488. An act to increase the fee of jurors in condemnation proceedings instituted by the District of Columbia;

S. 490. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia";

S. 492. An act to provide that children be committed to the Board of Public Welfare in lieu of being committed to the National Training School for Girls; that the property and personnel of the National Training School for Girls be available for the care of children committed to or accepted by the Board of Public Welfare; and for other purposes;

S. 494. An act to provide for the appointment of a deputy disbursing officer and assistant disbursing officers for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 573. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 7, 1938, and for other purposes; and

S. 673. An act to permit the exchange of land belonging to the District of Columbia for land belonging to the abutting property owner or owners, and for other purposes.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, returning from the debate on the St. Lawrence seaway, to the subject which is the unfinished business, the agricultural appropriation bill, as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee having the appropriation in charge, I feel that it behooves me to make an observation or two relative to the bill.

I believe that all members of the Committee on Appropriations and probably all Members of the Senate, are in favor of soil conservation. I think the question resolves itself into how fast such programs should be financed, and on what scale they should be financed by appropriations. I have been a firm believer in soil conservation, both in connection with civil functions projects, in the main streams, in Interior Department reclamation projects affecting the upper and tributary streams. The question always arises, however, as to the amount of the appropriation we should make. There are Members of the Senate who are making a genuine effort now, as they have in years gone by, to see to it that the programs do not suffer; that they are carried out on a fair basis, but keeping in mind the tremendous expenditures we are going to be called upon to make in the form of appropriations in the next 2 or 3 years.

As I stated, I am a member of the Appropriations Committee. I have served on that committee since I came to the Senate. I am a member of the subcommittee handling the agricultural appropriation bill. I am a member of six or seven other subcommittees. One of them deals with the armed services.

Mr. President, I do not have before me the exact figures in dollars, but I shall undertake to state in round figures the appropriations which the 1952 budget calls for. The military has already asked for a 1952 budget of about sixty and one-half billion dollars. In addition to that there are proposals before the Armed Services Committee for a six and one-half billion military construction program for the activation of defense installations in this country and abroad. I am not quarreling with the merits of these figures. I am simply recounting them for the benefit of the Members of the Senate.

On top of the sixty and one-half billion dollars for the military budget and another six and one-half billion for military construction a request has also been made for eight and one-half billion dollars to provide mutual defense for the North Atlantic Pact countries and to continue economic aid. That totals in the neighborhood of $76,000,000,000.

The Armed Services Committee was told during the past week, in no uncertain terms, that after the 1952 budget has been passed the military will come to Congress, between now and October 1, and ask for an additional $20,000,000,000, primarily to expand the Air Force. If those items are asked for and are approved—and I do not doubt that the military establishments are making this recommendation in all sincerity—they will total ninety-five and one-half billion dollars for military and mutual-defense appropriations asked for in the 1952 budget.

On top of that, we have to add the civilian budget—and for the life of me I cannot see how it can be less than $12,000,000,000. Add $95,500,000,000 to $12,500,000,000 and we get some idea of the tremendous appropriations that must be made, and the tremendous load the taxpayers of the country will be called upon to carry in 1952.

That would not be so bad if we could see the end of such huge appropriations, but once again, speaking as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I will say that each and every time witnesses appear we are told that this is not the peak; that in 1953 we can look for even heavier appropriations so far as the military budget is concerned, and that there will be no leveling off until the fiscal year 1954, and then it will depend upon the world situation at that time.

I am not complaining about the requests. I am not at this time discussing their merits. I am simply laying before the Senate and before the American people a statement of the tremendous appropriations which we shall be called upon to make in order properly to provide for the security of the United States and the welfare of our people.

When we come to tried and proven and tested programs, such as are in the Interior Department bill, in the civil

functions bill, or in the pending agriculture appropriation bill, we must decide whether or not they would be handicapped by cuts in the appropriations, or whether we should appropriate at the figures requested by the Bureau of the Budget.

Each Senator has a perfect right to make up his own mind. Certainly the chairman of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee is well informed on agricultural matters. There is no one who likes to follow him better than I do in his recommendations as to these great programs. On the other hand, in the committee I voted to cut this particular program. My vote was cast by proxy by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. I was unable to attend at that time. I felt that the appropriation of $225,000,000 recommended by the House might provide the wherewithal to continue the agricultural program on a satisfactory basis for 1952.

I am not saying that that is the correct figure. I doubt if any Member of the Senate knows what the correct figure should be for this program in the coming year. But I say to Members of the Senate that we must make reductions wherever we can without jeopardizing the national defense and without jeopardizing the national defense and without jeopardizing the welfare of our people, if we are to keep the United States from going bankrupt financially.

Yesterday I was told that the Government is spending 25 percent of the national income. Add to that what is paid in local and State taxes, and we can see that we are reaching a point pretty close to where the Government is taking a third of what the people of the country produce. In England the Government takes 40 percent. That 40 percent has driven the British into socialism. That is exactly what confronts our people if the percentage of the people's money represented by government expenditures continues to increase. It is a serious problem. How much can we spend? That is the question which we must answer in all sincerity, if we are to protect the financial stability of this country and provide for its security.

Last week on the floor of the Senate I called attention to the fact that there are Senators who rise on this floor time after time and advocate reductions in appropriations at home, but they would not advocate such reductions with respect to the programs abroad. I shall not mention the names of those Senators. I am not criticizing them. They have a perfect right to vote any way they please. But it is a sad commentary that there are those who would vote to reduce domestic programs, while billions of ECA and other foreign-aid dollars are flowing into projects throughout the world. They are willing to make reductions at home, where we need conservation and production programs as much as they are needed anywhere; but they are not willing to make reductions in foreign-aid programs.

Last week I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD certain figures, referring to reclamation projects in Italy, financed by ECA dollars. I was not exactly challenged, but I was asked for more information. At that time I asked unanimous consent to supply such information. One of my assistants has worked continuously to try to gather the correct information from ECA records. The tabulations which I have before me will give a picture of what this country has done in the way of carrying out programs abroad while denying them in our own country.

The ECA funds which have been sent abroad from the beginning of the program, accumulative as of May 31, 1951, total nearly $12,000,000,000. I am speaking of funds for all purposes—food, clothing, projects, materials, and commodities—since the inauguration of the program back in 1948. Projects did not really get under way until 1949.

I ask unanimous consent that the tables on pages 6 and 7 of the publication of the Economic Cooperation Administration entitled "Procurement Authorizations," issued by the Division of Statistics and Reports of the Economic Cooperation Administration May 31, 1951, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. These tables break down the total amount of money authorized to be spent by ECA recipient countries since the beginning of ECA. The total amount is about $12,000,000,000.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Procurement authorizations by commodity group and country of destination, cumulative, Apr. 3, 1948, to May 31, 1951

[Millions of dollars]

Commodity group	Total	Country of destination															
		United Kingdom	France	Italy	Germany (Federal Republic)	Netherlands	Austria	Belgium-Luxemburg	Greece	Denmark	Norway	Ireland	Turkey	Sweden	Portugal	Trieste	Iceland
Grand total [1]	11,492.7	2,712.2	2,337.1	1,289.8	1,286.1	954.1	543.0	530.6	502.0	252.3	222.6	145.9	123.6	118.4	46.6	33.1	22.0
Commodity total	10,233.3	2,619.5	2,015.3	1,153.5	1,184.7	927.0	475.5	504.0	431.2	247.4	219.1	143.8	103.9	118.4	44.1	27.5	18.6
Food and agricultural commodities	5,038.4	1,374.5	621.0	558.9	904.1	433.1	335.8	172.1	274.4	111.3	97.5	103.1	12.8	2.1	19.1	12.3	6.4
Industrial commodities	5,195.0	1,245.0	1,394.3	594.6	280.6	493.9	139.7	331.9	156.8	136.0	121.6	40.7	91.0	116.3	25.1	15.2	12.3
Technical services	53.7	8.3	14.7	10.8	2.1	2.4	.1	.1	4.1	------	1.1	------	9.5	------	.1	------	.4
Ship disbursements	9.2	2.0	2.0	------	.5	2.5	------	1.4	.3	------	.5	------	------	------	------	------	------
Prepaid freight account	23.3	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Assistance via European Payments Union	38.3	------	------	------	------	------	10.0	------	25.3	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	3.0
European Payments Union, capital fund	350.0	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Ocean freight	784.9	82.4	305.1	125.5	98.9	22.2	57.4	25.2	41.2	4.9	2.0	2.0	10.2	------	2.4	5.6	------
COMMODITY DETAIL																	
Food, feed, and fertilizer	3,163.1	875.8	249.7	223.7	552.1	300.9	281.8	147.9	261.8	73.5	78.1	68.5	12.8	------	19.1	11.2	6.3
Bread grains	1,609.2	546.0	79.6	194.2	195.4	145.9	142.1	54.0	146.1	5.6	39.3	20.3	12.8	------	19.1	7.0	1.7
Wheat	1,292.8	462.4	59.4	153.5	166.8	99.1	106.4	53.3	126.4	1.4	23.1	16.7	11.3	------	8.9	4.3	------
Wheat flour	253.3	83.6	20.2	40.7	22.8	28.1	19.4	.8	19.8	.2	9.1	2.4	1.5	------	.3	2.7	1.7
Rye	21.7	------	------	------	5.8	.8	13.8	------	------	------	.3	------	------	------	1.0	------	------
Unclassified	41.4	------	------	------	------	17.9	2.6	------	------	4.0	6.9	1.2	------	------	8.8	------	------
Coarse grains	394.2	------	53.4	2.9	162.3	42.9	39.2	6.1	4.0	20.4	18.0	45.1	------	------	------	------	------
Corn	261.6	------	44.5	2.9	80.2	27.4	33.4	3.6	2.1	14.9	14.0	38.8	------	------	------	------	------
Grain sorghums and buckwheat	84.6	------	.5	------	68.1	3.3	1.8	.3	------	2.2	2.0	6.4	------	------	------	------	------
Barley	25.5	------	1.9	------	6.8	5.9	3.7	2.2	1.2	2.6	1.2	------	------	------	------	------	------
Oats	22.5	------	6.5	------	7.2	6.3	.3	------	.7	.6	.9	------	------	------	------	------	------

Footnotes at end of table.

Procurement authorizations by commodity group and country of destination, cumulative, Apr. 3, 1948, to May 31, 1951—Continued

[Millions of dollars]

Commodity group	Total	Country of destination															
		United Kingdom	France	Italy	Germany (Federal Republic)	Netherlands	Austria	Belgium-Luxemburg	Greece	Denmark	Norway	Ireland	Turkey	Sweden	Portugal	Trieste	Iceland
COMMODITY DETAIL—continued																	
Food, feed, and fertilizer—Con.																	
Fats and oils	341.3	9.3	65.8	17.3	87.8	43.1	58.4	24.0	5.8	15.3	10.7	0.2				2.7	0.9
Peanuts	57.0		17.4	8.1	18.0	.4	12.0			.2	.4					.5	
Soybeans	44.8		9.3	2.2	9.7	7.8		3.0		9.9	2.8						
Flaxseed	42.1		10.4	2.6		24.8		.2			4.1						
Copra	29.5		10.3	1.2	9.3		3.5			2.8	2.5						
Oilseeds, n. e. c.	10.9		4.3		2.7	.2	3.0			.6							
Lard	53.7	9.3	4.9	.5	15.8		20.8	2.1								.3	
Soybean oil	35.6		1.4	1.1	11.0	1.2	11.1	2.5	5.1	.7		.2				.6	.8
Tallow	24.1		3.9	.4	6.6	2.8	2.5	6.5	.1		.9					.3	
Linseed oil	10.8		1.9		2.7	3.8	2.1		.3								
Whale oil and fish oils	8.3		.1		6.3	.7	1.2										
Soap, soap stock, and fatty acids	6.0				1.4		.3	4.3									
Other and unclassified	18.5		1.9	1.3	4.3	1.3	1.8	5.5	.4	1.0						.9	
Sugar and related products	304.7	134.4	12.5		53.8	29.7	16.2	14.3	40.2		2.8	.6					.3
Sugar, etc	285.1	115.6	12.5		53.8	29.7	16.2	14.3	39.5		2.8	.5					.3
Molasses, inedible	19.7	18.8							.7			.2					
Meat	129.7	75.6	1.1		18.5	4.4	4.4	10.8	14.5	.2		.2				.1	
Beef, veal, pork, lamb, and mutton	87.1	68.9	.4			4.0	.7	.5	12.6								
Horsemeat	20.3				8.6	.4	2.0	9.3									
Canned meat and poultry	18.9	6.7			9.9		1.3		1.0							.1	
Other and unclassified	3.3		.7				.3	1.0	.9	.2		.2					
Dairy products	116.9	69.0	11.8		.2	1.3	.4	13.5	19.5							1.2	
Cheese	75.2	68.2						4.9	2.2								
Milk	40.3		11.6		.1	1.3	.4	8.4	17.3							1.2	
Other and unclassified	1.3	.8	.2		.1			.2									
Feeds and fodder	55.9	.1	6.3	.2	2.6	4.9	2.4			29.5	7.3						2.5
Oilcake and oilcake meal	47.3		5.5		1.5	4.2	2.0			26.9	7.2						
Other	8.7	.1	.8	.2	1.1	.7	.4			2.6	.1						2.5
Fertilizer	49.4	1.5	12.8	2.4	5.9	7.4	6.5	.7	11.8								.6
Nitrogenous	30.8		12.8	.6		5.2			11.8								.5
Other	18.6	1.5		1.8	5.9	2.2	6.5	.7									.1
Fruits and nuts, except peanuts	35.5	15.6			5.9		.8	12.4		.3		.4					
Rice	30.5		1.6		.5	18.7	1.8	1.7	5.8	.2							.2
Coffee	21.9			1.9	4.6		.2	5.6	8.0	1.7							
Vegetables and preparations	20.1		.1		11.8	.2	3.0	1.1	3.8			.1					.1
Eggs	18.5	13.6			2.0		2.7	.3									
Fish and fish products, except fish oil and meal	17.0	10.8		3.0				1.1	1.4			.7					
Seeds, other than oilseeds	7.3		2.5	.9	.3	.9	1.6	.1	.3	.2		.4					.1
Miscellaneous grain preparations	7.0		1.7	.9	.1	.6	2.1	.2	.7	.2		.5					
Miscellaneous edible agricultural products	4.2		.6	.1	.4	1.0		2.0								2	
Fuel	1,534.2	331.1	549.0	207.2	52.1	76.8	29.2	61.9	21.6	63.3	35.9	13.3	2.8	67.7	8.7	12.3	1.3
Petroleum and products	1,230.9	331.1	378.6	126.8	52.1	60.4	3.5	60.0	21.0	56.3	35.6	13.3	2.8	67.7	8.7	11.7	1.2
Coal and related products	303.3		170.4	80.3		16.3	25.8	1.9	.5	7.0	.3					.6	.1
Raw materials and semifinished products	3,313.4	1,003.7	670.8	425.5	458.8	343.2	91.6	96.2	59.5	51.6	58.4	14.6	8.2	24.2	1.9	2.7	2.3
Cotton	1,357.3	267.1	335.0	328.7	251.0	98.2	38.4	6.7	10.1	17.0	1.8	.2		2.1		1.0	
Raw cotton, except linters	1,353.6	268.3	331.9	329.9	247.7	98.4	38.5	6.5	10.2	17.1	1.8	.2		2.1		1.0	
Cotton linters	11.2	4.1	2.1	.3	3.9	.6		.2									
Cotton waste	3.5	1.7	1.3		.6												
Unclassified cotton commodity reductions	−10.9	−6.9	−.2	−1.5	−1.2	−.8	−.1		−.1	−.1							
Nonferrous metals and products	649.9	336.9	133.9	45.8	46.8	49.3	9.6	.7	4.0	13.8	5.4		.9	2.4		.3	.3
Copper	352.8	124.3	108.9	45.6	24.8	27.4	5.4		2.6	10.2	3.2		.1			.1	.2
Aluminum	123.0	111.1	.2		1.2	5.3		.6	1.2	.4			.7	2.2		.1	.1
Zinc	79.6	64.7	5.2		4.1	3.0	.8			1.7							
Lead	57.3	34.6	6.6			11.8	.8			1.4	2.2						
Brass and bronze	9.3		5.1		2.4	.7	.9			.1			.1	.1			
Nickel	6.2		3.6	.2	1.7	.3	.3		.1								
Tin	2.0				.8		1.1										
Other, including precious metals	19.7	2.2	4.4		11.7	.8	.3	.1	.1					.1			
Iron and steel mill materials and products including ferroalloys	286.8	53.9	47.9	20.8	4.1	67.2	7.5	13.3	11.7	14.3	31.8	2.1	3.1	6.5	1.6	.4	.7

Footnotes at end of table.

Procurement authorizations by commodity group and country of destination, cumulative, Apr. 3, 1948, to May 31, 1951—Continued

[Millions of dollars]

Commodity group	Total	Country of destination															
		United Kingdom	France	Italy	Germany (Federal Republic)	Netherlands	Austria	Belgium-Luxemburg	Greece	Denmark	Norway	Ireland	Turkey	Sweden	Portugal	Trieste	Iceland
COMMODITY DETAIL—continued																	
Raw materials and semifinished products—Continued																	
Chemicals and related products	270.9	65.0	78.8	15.7	21.9	21.5	14.0	27.0	13.2	1.4	2.7	.4	3.4	5.1	0.2	0.4	0.1
Medicinal and pharmaceutical preparations	51.6	------	21.4	8.7	3.5	2.2	3.8	4.7	4.8	.3	.3	.4	.8	.2	.2	.3	------
Industrial chemicals, except alcohol	37.9	5.4	8.8	.2	8.5	4.4	2.4	5.0	1.1	.1	.9	------	.1	1.0	------	------	------
Alcohol	16.8	13.8	1.2	------	1.0	.3	.2	.3	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
Pesticides	6.0	------	.5	1.0	------	.3	.1	------	2.0	.1	------	------	1.9	------	------	------	------
Other	158.5	45.9	46.8	5.8	8.9	14.3	7.5	17.1	5.2	.9	1.4	------	.5	4.0	------	.1	.1
Metallic ores and concentrates	135.5	58.8	15.3	.6	26.2	8.3	2.2	21.7	------	------	1.9	------	------	.4	------	------	------
Lumber and lumber manufactures	124.1	81.6	6.5	1.0	6.7	6.9	1.1	6.5	7.7	.2	1.1	3.6	.7	------	------	.5	.1
Pulp and paper	114.5	73.5	10.6	.1	20.2	.8	.1	2.6	.9	------	------	5.2	------	------	------	.1	.4
Fabricated basic textiles	113.6	7.4	4.8	5.2	6.4	65.8	.8	3.5	4.1	.8	9.6	2.1	------	2.5	------	------	.6
Nonmetallic minerals	103.1	42.1	24.5	.8	6.6	5.3	3.3	10.7	1.4	1.3	1.2	.2	.2	5.3	.2	------	.1
Hides, skins, and leather	80.6	2.8	.3	5.3	41.9	11.6	8.6	2.6	6.4	------	.4	.7	------	------	------	------	------
Fibers, except unmanufactured cotton and wool	37.4	5.5	12.9	------	9.1	3.7	.7	.7	------	2.6	2.2	------	------	------	------	------	------
Naval stores	26.0	9.0	.1	1.4	10.5	3.8	.1	.3	------	.3	.3	.1	------	------	------	.1	------
Wool, unmanufactured	12.9	------	------	------	7.6	------	5.2	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
Miscellaneous fiber products	.9	------	.2	------	------	.7	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
Machinery and vehicles	1,677.0	182.3	500.0	277.6	39.6	171.1	61.1	173.1	65.5	39.4	29.8	11.9	76.6	25.4	14.3	1.0	8.4
Machinery and equipment	1,314.2	177.9	383.5	272.2	33.7	95.3	59.1	73.1	50.8	31.1	27.2	7.6	62.8	21.7	10.0	1.0	7.2
Construction, mining, and conveying equipment	197.7	27.6	77.3	22.5	4.4	5.7	7.1	10.0	13.1	1.8	5.2	.8	17.0	2.5	2.1	------	.8
Metalworking machinery, except machine tools	196.9	29.2	56.6	56.8	3.1	11.6	23.8	12.1	.5	1.4	.4	------	------	.8	.7	------	------
Machine tools	127.7	16.8	36.0	40.5	6.7	7.2	5.7	4.9	1.3	1.7	.9	------	1.0	4.2	.1	.7	------
Electrical apparatus, except generators and motors	92.3	2.8	27.1	21.2	.2	8.1	.9	9.4	4.8	2.0	2.4	1.2	4.8	3.7	.7	------	3.0
Generators and motors	59.3	1.5	23.4	17.6	.5	3.3	3.8	1.3	2.9	1.1	.9	------	.3	.4	1.2	------	1.1
Engines and turbines	57.3	1.0	10.7	24.1	------	9.0	------	1.2	4.2	2.5	1.8	------	.1	------	2.2	------	.5
Industrial machinery, n. e. c.	374.9	67.3	68.4	82.2	18.8	33.3	15.7	28.9	15.4	13.1	12.6	4.1	3.1	8.5	2.4	.1	.9
Agricultural machinery, except tractors	103.5	20.0	45.3	1.7	------	6.1	.9	1.7	3.6	3.3	.7	.7	18.2	.8	.2	------	.4
Tractors, all types	104.6	11.7	38.8	5.6	------	11.0	1.3	3.6	5.0	4.3	2.4	.7	18.3	.9	.3	.2	.6
Motor vehicles, engines, and parts	211.3	3.4	19.1	.1	5.2	43.4	1.3	95.0	13.7	6.4	1.2	4.2	13.4	3.6	.8	------	.6
Aircraft, engines, and parts	99.2	------	58.0	4.8	------	29.5	------	4.2	.6	.8	1.0	------	------	.2	------	------	------
Other transportation equipment	52.4	1.1	39.3	.4	.7	2.9	.7	.8	.4	1.0	.4	------	.4	------	3.4	.1	.6
Miscellaneous and unclassified	545.5	226.5	45.9	19.6	82.1	35.0	11.8	24.9	22.9	19.6	16.8	35.5	3.3	1.0	.2	.2	.2
Tobacco	422.1	214.7	19.9	5.1	67.9	22.5	9.2	15.9	------	17.8	15.0	34.2	------	------	------	------	------
Miscellaneous industrial commodities	107.5	9.5	23.6	15.6	8.4	9.1	2.4	8.6	20.4	1.8	1.8	1.2	3.3	1.0	.2	.2	.2
Miscellaneous iron and steel manufactures	19.1	3.1	2.7	2.0	------	3.1	------	1.7	2.9	1.0	.3	1.2	.6	.3	------	.1	.1
Scientific and professional instruments	15.1	.1	2.4	4.0	.3	1.5	.6	2.0	2.2	.2	.6	------	.4	.4	.2	.1	------
Other	73.4	6.4	18.5	9.6	8.2	4.4	1.8	4.9	15.3	.6	.9	------	2.3	.3	------	------	.1
Miscellaneous inedible animal and vegetable products	20.1	2.6	3.4	------	5.9	4.1	.4	.6	2.5	.3	.1	.1	------	------	------	------	------
Unclassified industrial commodity reductions	−3.6	−.1	−1.0	−1.1	−.1	−.5	−.2	−.2	------	−.2	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
Unclassified agricultural commodity reductions	−.6	−.2	−.1	------	------	−.1	------	------	------	−.1	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

[1] Including procurement authorizations for overseas territory development.
[2] Not available.

NOTE.—Totals shown are sums of unrounded figures, hence may vary slightly from totals of rounded amounts. Overseas territories are reported with recipient mother countries.

Source: Office of the Controller, Reports and Analysis Branch, Division of Statistics and Reports, June 11, 1951.

Mr. WHERRY. I have asked my assistant to furnish the Senate with the amount out of the total of nearly $12,000,000,000, which has been spent on industrial projects—not food, not clothing, not medical supplies, but projects—for the period ending June 30, 1951. He financed industrial projects in ERP countries alone to the number of 139, representing a total of $565,430,000. Those projects are set forth in exhibit A, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the exhibit was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT A

Industrial projects approved in ERP countries (in Europe) as of June 30, 1951

ERP countries	Number of projects	Total cost	ECA cost
		Thous. of dol.	*Thous. of dol.*
Austria	15	81,779	36,986
Belgium	4	50,523	15,190
Denmark	1	9,529	5,070
France	39	751,092	148,354
Germany (Federal Republic)	2	10,719	2,507
Greece	13	112,900	32,512
Iceland	3	15,875	7,645
Italy	33	435,562	170,917
Netherlands	2	67,920	26,872
Norway	2	29,660	5,134
Portugal	5	28,522	9,167
United Kingdom	7	421,383	51,018
Turkey	12	205,869	53,518
International (Austria-Germany)	1	28,600	540
Total ERP country projects	139	2,250,003	565,430

Industrial projects approved and ECA-financed costs as of June 30, 1951

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project, company and location	Total cost	ECA cost
AUSTRIA		
Total industrial projects approved	81,779	36,986
Manufacturing	73,719	33,905
Steel	47,702	24,761
Alpine Montan (OAM), Donawitz, Austria (blooming mill)	6,086	4,023
Alpine Montan, Donawitz, Austria (rail and structural mill)	6,166	4,206
Alpine Montan, Donawitz, Austria (continuous hillet mill)	7,318	3,239
United Austrian Iron & Steel Works (VOEST) (slabbing and blooming mill)	8,843	2,878
United Austrian Iron & Steel Works, Linz, Austria (hot strip mill)	15,927	8,225
United Austrian Iron & Steel Works, Linz, Austria (reversing cold-rolling mill)	3,362	2,190
Paper	26,017	9,144
Arland Paper—Und Zellstoffahriken A. G., Andritz & Rechberg, Austria	2,647	1,169
Brigl & Bergmeister A. G. at Niklasdorf/Mur, Stzk., Austria	3,575	1,129
Franz Mayr-Melnhof & Co., Karton & Papier-fabrik, Frohnleiten, Austria	1,189	564
Ley-Kam-Josefsthal A. G. at Gratwein, Austria (pulp and paper mill)	4,741	1,101

Industrial projects approved and ECA-financed costs as of June 30, 1951—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project, company and location	Total cost	ECA cost
AUSTRIA—continued		
Manufacturing—Continued		
Paper—Continued		
Murztal Pulp & Paper Manufacturing Co. Ltd., at Bruck a. d. Mur, Austria	3,714	1,604
Natronzellstoff—Und Aktiengesellschaft, Nettingsdorf, Austria (paper mill equipment)	3,079	1,297
Nettingsdorfer Papierfabrik, Nettingsdorf, Austria (pulp and paper)	7,072	2,280
Raw materials extraction	8,060	3,081
Iron ore mining: Alpine Montan, Eisenerz, Austria Iron Ore Mine Erzberg	7,565	2,611
Oil drilling: Rohoel-Gewinnungs Aktiengesellschaft at Vienna, Austria (oil drilling equipment)	495	495
BELGIUM		
Total industrial projects approved	50,523	15,190
Manufacturing	50,523	15,190
Steel	39,523	13,655
Esperance Longdoz Iron & Steel Co., Liege, Belgium	17,023	2,823
Phoenix Co., Flemalle-Haute near Liege, Belgium	5,700	3,182
S. A. Ougree Marihaye, at Ougree, Belgium	16,800	7,650
Cement: Cimentaries et Briqueteries Reunies, Lixhe, Belgium	11,000	1,535
Total industrial projects approved	9,529	5,070
Transportation, communication, and utilities	9,529	5,070
Power facilities: Isefjordsvaerket (I FV) Kynby, Denmark (60,000-kilowatts thermal)	9,529	5,070
FRANCE		
Total industrial projects approved	751,092	148,354
Manufacturing	398,823	104,619
Steel	226,983	70,494
Acieries de Longwy at Mont-Saint-Martin	7,210	2,500
J. J. Carnaud et Forges de Basse-Indre, Basse-Indre, France	10,000	2,200
USINOR (Union Sidérurgique du Nord de la France) Montatire and Denain, France	60,574	13,074
SOLLAC (Société Lorraine de Laminage Continu), Hayange and Ebange, France	133,060	49,360
Société Lorraine des Aciéries de Rombas, Rombas, France	8,709	1,300
Ste. Anonyme des Forges et Acieries de Dilling at Dilligen (Saar)	7,430	2,060
Aluminum	4,000	2,300
Etablissements Charles Coquillard, Froges, France	2,000	1,100
Société des Tréfileries et Laminoirs du Havre, Rugles, France	2,000	1,200
Petroleum Refining	122,605	16,633
Standard Française des Pétroles (SFP), Port Jerome, France	10,000	1,750
Compagnie Française de Raffinage (CFR), La Mède and Gonfreville, France	10,000	2,850
Socony-Vacuum Française, Notre Dame de Gravenchon, France	6,000	850

Industrial projects approved and ECA-financed costs as of June 30, 1951—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project, company and location	Total cost	ECA cost
FRANCE—continued		
Manufacturing—Continued		
Petroleum Refining—Continued		
Raffineries Françaises de Pétrole de L'Atlantique, Donges, France	9,435	750
Société Generale des Huiles de Pétrole (SGHP), Dunkirk, France	38,105	4,005
Compagnie Française de Raffinage (CFR), La Mède and Gonfreville, France	11,000	3,150
Standard Française des Pétroles (SFR), Port Jerome, France	6,415	1,428
Compagnie de Raffinage Shell Barre, Barre, France	31,650	1,850
Automotive Products	22,835	10,427
CIMA, Saint Dizier, Croix and Montataire, France	13,000	4,600
Société SIMCA, Nanterre, France	8,150	4,142
Société Citroen in French Plants	1,685	1,685
Chemicals: Société Naphtachimie, L'Etang de Berre, France	12,418	1,793
General industrial equipment: Schneider & Co	8,600	1,930
Tire cord: Le Blan Compagnie, Lille, France	1,382	1,042
Raw materials extraction	146,970	10,804
Iron oremining: SECM (Société Pour l'Etude du Chargement Mécanique), Lorraine, France	4,000	4,000
Potash mining: Mines Domaniales de Potasse d'Alsace, Alsace, France	125,000	4,000
Oil drilling	17,970	2,804
Société d'Etudes et de Recherches Petrolieres, Middle Alsace, France	455	200
Pechelbronn S. A. E. M., Alsace, France	860	400
Regie Autonome des Pétroles, Region North of St. Marcet, France	570	200
Société Nationale des Pétroles d'Aquitaine, Southwest, France	510	275
Société Nationale du Languedoc Mediterraneen, Southwest, France	575	279
S. N. Repal (Algeria) SCP (Morocco) and SEREPT (Tunisia) French North Africa	15,000	1,450
Transportation, communication, and utilities	142,299	31,531
Power facilities	59,345	20,930
Boiler equipment for steam—100,000 kw. steam electric unit at Nantes-Chevire for electricité de France	19,845	1,930
100,000 kw. thermal plant for Charbonnages de France, Déchy, France	19,500	15,000
Boiler for steam-electric station at Arrighi for Electricité de France	20,000	4,000
Communications: French Ministry of Posts, Telegraphs, and Telephones	60,000	1,290
Air transport	22,954	9,311
Aeromaritime, S. A	993	850
Aigle-Azur, France and France Overseas Territories	550	550
French Aircraft Industry	3,411	3,411
Société Nationale de Constructions Aeronautiques du Sud-EST (S. N. C. A. S. E.), Blagnac, France	18,000	4,500
Other, irrigation and reclamation: Extension, Office du Niger Irrigation Project, French West Africa	63,000	1,400

Industrial projects approved and ECA-financed costs as of June 30, 1951—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project, company and location	Total cost	ECA cost
GERMANY (FEDERAL REPUBLIC)		
Total industrial projects approved	10,719	2,507
Manufacturing	10,719	2,507
Glass: Glaswerke Ruhr A. G., Essen-Karnap, Germany	2,049	1,837
Petroleum refining: Gewerkschaft Erdoel-Raffinerie Emsland, Lingen, Germany	8,670	670
GREECE		
Total industrial projects approved	112,900	32,512
Manufacturing	8,773	4,264
Cement: General Cement Co., S. A. Piraeus, Greece	5,180	2,432
Glass: Hellenic Chemical Products and Fertilizer Co., Athens, Greece	3,593	1,832
Raw materials extraction:		
Coal mining: Lignite production in Aliveri and Kimi Territory for Greek Government	10,197	3,873
Transportation, communications and utilities	86,930	22,375
Power facilities:		
Athens Piraeus Electric Co., Ltd., Athens-Piraeus area, Greece	8,000	3,060
68,000-kilowatt thermal electric plant in Euhean Gulf Territory for Greek Government	15,461	10,972
Electric transmission, transformation, and distribution out of thermal plant in Euhean Gulf territory for Greek Government	12,078	1,337
40,000 KW hydroelectric plant at Agra on Vodas River for Greek Government	8,008	1,491
Electric transmission, transformation, and distribution out of Agra plant in Macedonia and Thrace Territory for Greek Government	14,899	1,572
50,000 KW hydroelectric plant at Ladhon for Greek Government	14,522	2,177
Electric transmission, transformation, and distribution out of Ladhon plant into Athens-Piraeus and Peloponnese Territories for Greek Government	10,045	1,196
5,000 KW hydroelectric plant at Louros for Greek Government	2,966	487
Electric transformation and distribution out of Louros and in surrounding Territory of Epirus	951	83
Engineering and technical studies: Owner/engineer services to Greek Government on Greek electric-power program	7,000	2,000
ICELAND		
Total industrial projects approved	15,875	7,645
Manufacturing	4,660	2,580
Fertilizer: Nitrogenous fertilizer plant near Reykjavik for the Government of Iceland	4,660	2,580
Transportation, communications, and utilities	11,215	5,065
Power facilities:		
Reykjavik Municipal Electric Light & Power Co. on the Sog River	8,575	3,955
Iceland State Power Board on the Laxa River	2,640	1,110

Industrial projects approved and ECA-financed costs as of June 30, 1951—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project, company and location	Total cost	ECA cost
ITALY		
Total industrial projects approved	435,562	170,917
Manufacturing	314,378	100,337
Steel	170,054	51,538
ILVA (Alti Forni e Acciaierie d'Italia) Bagnoli and Piombino, Italy	112,247	27,470
Fiat, Turin, Italy	24,950	7,634
Acciaierie e Ferriere Lombarde Falck, Milan, Italy	4,200	2,200
Cogne, S. P. A., Aosta Valley, Italy	1,500	1,034
SISMA, Villadossola, Italy	5,230	2,450
ILSSA-Viola, Pont St. Martin, Aosta Valley, Italy	2,900	1,465
FERROTUBI (Già F. I. T.), Milan, Italy	480	220
Cantieri Metallurgici Italiani (Falck), Castellammare di Stabia, Italy	2,690	2,152
TERNI-Società per l'Elettricita, Terni, Italy	4,895	1,407
Acciaierie e Ferriere Lombarde Falck, Milan, Italy	7,837	4,523
REDAELLI, Rogoredo, Italy	3,125	983
Petroleum refining	21,334	8,134
Aquila, S. P. A., Tecnico Industriale, Zaule, Italy	7,950	4,250
Società Permolio, Rome, Genoa and Milan, Italy	4,984	1,534
IROM (Società Raffinazione Olli Minerali), Porto Marghera, Italy	8,400	2,350
Paper: Cartiere Burgo, Verzuolo and Corsico, Italy	3,400	1,650
Automotive products: Fiat, Turin, Italy	69,379	23,052
Bearings and other products: Riv Officine di Villar Perosa, Turin and Villar Perosa, Italy	2,000	1,353
Chemicals	48,211	14,610
Montecatini, Po Valley, Italy	18,221	7,348
Terni, Bagnoli, Italy	11,320	4,500
Montecatini Olefin Plant, Ferrera, Italy	18,670	2,762
Transportation, communication, and utilities	111,073	67,167
Power facilities	105,613	62,667
Società Edison, Genoa, Italy (50,000-kilowatt thermal)	8,850	6,000
Società Generale Elettricità della Sicilia, Palermo, Sicily (60,000-kilowatt thermal)	11,050	6,300
Società Termoelettrica, Venice, Italy (50,000-kilowatt thermal)	10,038	6,558
Società Edison, Genoa, Italy (50,000-kilowatt thermal)	8,498	6,169
Società Idroelettrica Piemonte (SIP) near Turin (50,000-kilowatt thermal)	10,674	6,215
Società Romana di Elettricità, Civitavecchia, (Rome) (60,000-kilowatt thermal)	11,628	6,110
Società Meridionale di Elettricità, Naples, Italy (60,000-kilowatt thermal)	9,393	6,143
Società Edison, Placenza, Italy (100,000-kilowatt thermal)	13,929	9,323
Società Meridionale di Elettricità, Naples, Italy (30,000-kilowatt thermal)	5,392	3,652
STEI, near Tavazzano, Italy (120,000-kilowatt thermal)	10,877	2,680
Azienda Elettrica Municipalo di Torino (A. E. M.) Turin, Italy (30,000-kilowatt thermal)	5,284	3,517
Air transport: Linee Aeree Italiane	5,460	4,500
Raw materials extraction	10,111	3,413
Coal mining: Società Mineraria Carbonifera Sarda, Rome, Italy (Sulcis Field)	10,111	3,413

Industrial projects approved and ECA-financed costs as of June 30, 1951—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project, company and location	Total cost	ECA cost
NETHERLANDS		
Total industrial projects approved	67,990	26,872
Manufacturing	47,010	23,500
Steel: Royal Dutch Blast Furnace and Steel Co., Ijmuiden, Netherlands	47,010	23,500
Transportation, communication, and utilities	20,980	3,372
Power facilities: Noord-Brabrant (Provinciale Noord-hrabantsche Electriciteitmaatsebappij) Geertruidenberg, Noord-Brabant, Netherlands (124,000 kilowatts thermal)	20,980	3,372
NORWAY		
Total industrial projects approved	29,660	5,134
Raw materials extraction	29,660	5,134
Iron ore mining:		
Sydvaranger Iron Ore Co., near Kirkenes, Norway	29,000	5,014
Iron ore exploration in the Dunderland Valley	660	120
PORTUGAL		
Total industrial projects approved	28,522	9,167
Manufacturing	11,190	5,330
Steel: Steel tube mill at S. Joao da Madeira for A. J. Oliveira Filhos & Co., LDA	1,340	990
Paper: Wood pulp and paper mill at Cacia for Companhia Portuguesa de Celulose	9,850	4,340
Transportation, communications, and utilities	2,332	1,737
Air Transport: Airport equipment for Portuguese overseas territories	1,037	1,037
Merchant and fishing vessels: Equipment for hospital tender for Portuguese fishing fleet	1,295	700
Other	15,000	2,100
Irrigation and reclamation: Irrigation and power development in the Sorraia Valley and the Plains of Vila Franca for the Government of Portugal	15,000	2,100
TURKEY		
Total industrial projects approved	205,869	53,518
Manufacturing	7,444	1,425
Meat packing and storage: Meat packing and cold storage equipment in various plants, for the Government of Turkey	7,444	1,425
Raw materials extraction	55,831	13,317
Coal mining	50,831	12,317
Republic of Turkey, Zonguldak, coal fields	45,000	10,131
Republic of Turkey, western lignite coal mines	5,831	2,186
Iron ore mining: Republic of Turkey, iron ore mines at Divrik	5,000	1,000
Transportation, communication, and utilities	137,744	38,116
Power facilities	56,110	15,020
Republic of Turkey, Zonguldak	9,110	6,820
Sariyar hydroelectric power plant and related transmission lines	47,000	8,200
Air transport: Equipment for airport construction for the Turkish Government	4,324	712

Industrial projects approved and ECA-financed costs as of June 30, 1951—Con.

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project, company and location	Total cost	ECA cost
TURKEY—continued		
Roads and miscellaneous transportation facilities: Republic of Turkey (national highway system)	58,000	16,060
Railroads and equipment: Republic of Turkey, Zonguldak	3,000	1,000
Waterways and harbors	16,310	5,324
Republic of Turkey (harbor improvement at Zonguldak)	9,310	4,209
Republic of Turkey (coal and ore handling equipment for docks at Zonguldak)	7,000	1,115
Engineering and technical studies: Republic of Turkey (technical services to be provided in conjunction with industrial projects approved)	4,850	660
UNITED KINGDOM		
Total industrial projects approved	421,383	51,018
Manufacturing	421,383	51,018
Steel	308,800	30,313
Steel Co. of Wales, South Wales, England	240,000	27,000
Stewarts & Lloyds, Ltd., main plant at Corby, Northampton, England	63,200	2,730
Consett Iron Co., Ltd., Consett, England	5,600	583
Petroleum refining	82,000	9,705
National Oil Refiners, Ltd., Llandarcy Refinery, South Wales, England	48,000	7,250
Shell Refining and Marketing Co., Ltd., Shell Haven Refinery, England	34,000	2,455
Chemicals: British Petroleum Chemicals, Ltd., Grangemouth, England	17,000	6,500
Automotive: Ford Motor Co., Ltd., Dagenham, England	13,583	4,500
INTERNATIONAL		
Total industrial projects approved	28,600	540
Transportation, communication, and utilities:		
Power facilities: Austrian-German hydro power plant, Braunau on the Inn River	28,600	540

Mr. WHERRY. There were 63 industrial projects in overseas territories of ERP countries. I mean by that that the money did not go to the recipient countries, but went to colonies of the recipient ERP countries. The amount in dollars is set forth in exhibit B. It amounts to $63,791,000. I ask unanimous consent that exhibit B be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the exhibit was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT B

Overseas territories—Industrial projects approved and ECA-financed costs as of June 30, 1951

Country	Number of projects	ECA-financed cost
Territories of the United Kingdom:		
Fiscal year 1950	11	$1,235,000
Fiscal year 1951	14	11,078,000
Territories of France:		
Fiscal year 1950	6	4,116,000
Fiscal year 1951	25	27,992,000
Territories of the Netherlands:		
Fiscal year 1951	1	$1,448,000
Territories of Belgium:		
Fiscal year 1950	1	1,718,000
Fiscal year 1951	4	15,541,000
Territory of Portugal: Fiscal year 1951	1	663,000
Total overseas territories' projects	63	63,791,000

LIST OF PROJECTS APPROVED FOR AID FROM THE OVERSEAS DEVELOPMENT FUND AS OF JUNE 30, 1951—ECA-FINANCED COST

IN TERRITORIES OF THE UNITED KINGDOM

Grant aid totaling $1,235,000 in fiscal 1950 and $11,087,000 in fiscal 1951 was obligated in support of developmental programs and projects in the overseas dependencies of the United Kingdom. The over-all development program in the territories of the United Kingdom during calendar 1951 involves total investments estimated at approximately $207,000,000 equivalent. ECA aid for dollar-cost equipment and supplies going directly into specific projects is not available in a complete project-by-project breakdown. Therefore the total ECA cost by fiscal year is given.

Fiscal year 1950, $1,235,000

1. Nyasaland road-development project.
2. Nigeria road-development project.
3. Sierra Leone road-development project.
4. Gold Coast road-development project.
5. Northern Rhodesia road-development project.
6. Somaliland reservoir-construction project.
7. Mauritius agricultural equipment pool project.
8. Jamaica (Mid-Clarendon) irrigation.
9. Cyprus antierosion program project.
10. Sarawak road-development project.
11. North Borneo road-development project.

Fiscal year 1951, $11,078,000

1. Middle East locust-control program.
2. Kenya road-development project.
3. Malta power project.
4. Malaya road-development project.
5. Red locust-control project—East Africa.
6. British Borneo lumber project.
7. Nigeria road program.
8. Tanganyika roads—Morogoro-Iringa.
9. Northern Rhodesia—Broken Hill-Tunduma Road.
10. Nigeria—Enugu colliery.
11. North Borneo wharves.
12. Sierra Leone road bridges.
13. Gold Coast railroad project.
14. Tapakuma drainage and irrigation—British Guiana.

IN THE TERRITORIES OF FRANCE

Grant aid totaling $4,116,000 in fiscal 1950 and $27,992,000 in fiscal 1951 was obligated in support of developmental programs and projects in the oversea dependencies of France. The over-all development program in the territories of France during calendar 1951 involves total investments estimated at approximately $400,000,000 equivalent. ECA aid for dollar-cost equipment and supplies going directly into specific projects is not available in a complete project-by-project breakdown. Therefore, the total ECA cost by fiscal year is given.

Fiscal year 1950, $4,116,000

1. French West Africa road-development project.
2. French Cameroons road-development project.
3. French Equatorial Africa road construction.
4. Conakry iron-ore-deposit project.
5. Algerian soil-conservation project.
6. Morocco rice-cultivation project.

Fiscal year 1951, $27,992,000

Morocco

1. Djerada coal development.
2. Djerada water supply.
3. Casablanca power distribution.
4. Electric power-transmission system.
5. Stock watering and small irrigation projects.
6. Petroleum pipeline and refinery.
7. Cellulose (rayon pulp) plant.
8. Water supply for Moroccan coastal cities.
9. Casablanca water distribution.
10. Massa Valley irrigation project.
11. Casablanca—Workers' housing project.

Algeria

12. Electric power transmission.
13. Bone and Oran steam-power plants.
14. Agricultural service projects.
15. Wheat-storage facilities.
16. Petroleum development.
17. Oran and Mers-el-Kebir water supply.

Other French Territories

18. Port of Conakry (French Guinea).
19. Niger Valley irrigation (French Sudan).
20. Railroad reconstruction (French West Africa).
21. Transportation system (French Equatorial Africa).
22. Power development—Brazzaville area (French Equatorial Africa).
23. Water supply—Brazzaville.
24. Water supply—Douala (French Cameroons).
26. Domain—Fort Lamy road link.

IN THE NETHERLANDS TERRITORY, SURINAM

Grant aid from the Overseas Development Fund was obligated in the amount of $1,448,000 for a project approved in fiscal 1951, in support of a developmental program in the Netherlands Surinam, the aid provided being identified particularly with the following project:

Fiscal year 1951, $1,448,000

I. Surinam: Eysvoogel land-reclamation project.

IN THE BELGIAN CONGO

Loan aid totaling $1,718,000 in fiscal 1950, and loan aid totaling $15,500,000 and grant aid totaling $41,000 were obligated in support of a developmental program and projects in the Belgian Congo. The over-all development program in the Congo during calendar 1951 involved total investments estimated at approximately $160,000,000 equivalent. ECA aid for dollar-cost equipment and supplies going directly into specific projects is not available in a complete project-by-project breakdown. Therefore, the total ECA cost by fiscal year is given.

Fiscal year 1950, $1,718,000

1. The Belgian Congo road project.

Fiscal year 1951, $15,541,000

1. Belgian Congo soil survey.
2. Belgian Congo waterways project.
3. Belgian Congo power project.
4. Belgian Congo road project.

IN PORTUGUESE ANGOLA

Loan aid from the overseas development fund was obligated in the amount of $663,000 for a project approved in fiscal 1951, in support of a developmental program in Portuguese Angola, the aid provided being identified particularly with the following project:

Fiscal year 1951, $663,000

1. Angola meat industry project.

Mr. WHERRY. We also financed 140 industrial projects in the Far East, in

the amount of $54,262,000. These projects are set forth in exhibit C. I ask unanimous consent that exhibit C be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the exhibit was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT C

Industrial projects approved in the Far East as of June 30, 1951

[Thousands of dollars]

Country	Number of projects	ECA-financed costs
Burma	30	7,775
Formosa (Taiwan)	21	8,675
Indochina (Associated States)	29	6,818
Indonesian Republic	10	6,026
Philippines	25	8,243
Thailand	18	8,406
China	1	303
Korea	6	8,016
Total Far East projects	140	54,262

BURMA

		ECA-financed cost (thousands of dollars)
Projects, grand total		7,775
Agricultural and fishery projects		1,241
001	Upper Burma irrigation	70
002	Lower Burma flood control	234
003	Agricultural improvements in the Shan States	54
004	Soil conservation in Shan States	6
005	Burma canning project	10
006	Burma livestock disease control	28
008	Mandalay Agricultural College project	76
009	Laboratory rehabilitation program	18
010	Rice storage project	320
011	Seed improvement and distributing project	168
012	Insect and plant disease control	22
013	Cotton seed improvement and distribution	111
014	Classification of land and water resources	3
015	Agricultural extension work	8
016	Animal industry in Shan, Kachin, and Karenni States	59
	Technical assistance	54
Industrial projects		4,588
101	Harbor development	1,395
102	Engineering advisory services	800
104	Low-cost housing	18
106	Burma outpost rehabilitation	1,565
107	Union Bank of Burma	4
109	University of Rangoon	149
112	Rangoon port rehabilitation	542
	Technical assistance	115
Public health projects		1,449
201	Medical teams	670
202	Pasteur Institute	20
203	Hospital maintenance and equipment	292
204	Burma medical and sanitation equipment	98
206	Quarantine activities	19
207	District hospitals	50
210	General health activities	300
Other public services		497
301	Audio-visual service	475
	Technical assistance	22

FORMOSA (TAIWAN)

		ECA-financed cost (thousands of dollars)
Projects, grand total		8,675
Agricultural and fishery projects		100
001	Operations of J.C. R. R.	100
Industrial projects		7,989
101	Bridge at Silo Taiwan (Formosa)	1,163
102	Road building and repair	109
103	Pulverizer mill for Pei-Pu Station	207

Industrial projects approved in the Far East as of June 30, 1951—Continued

FORMOSA (TAIWAN)—continued

		ECA-financed cost (thousands of dollars)
INDUSTRIAL PROJECT—continued		
104	Rehabilitation of Li-Wi power plant	669
105	Addition of power transformer at Taipei (Formosa)	316
106	Completion of Tien-Leong hydroelectric power project	1,540
107	Improvement of power transmission and distribution system	1,016
108	Railway bridge steel	175
109	Engineering advisory service	800
110	Creosoting plant	300
111	Ship repair material	150
112	Ammonium sulfate plant	275
113	Well-drilling project	150
114	Copper and gold mining	527
115	Cement plant equipment	233
116	Pulp and paper	70
117	Alkali plant equipment	61
118	Coal-mining equipment	193
	Technical assistance	35
Public health projects		411
201	Medical team	400
210	General health activities	11
Other public services projects		175
Technical assistance		175

INDOCHINA (ASSOCIATED STATES)

Projects, grand total		6,818
Agricultural and fishery projects		756
002	Cambodian rice production	175
003	Cambodian forestry services	162
004	Cambodia fisheries	125
026	Laotian agricultural	15
051	Vietnam irrigation rehabilitation development	98
052	Vietnam fisheries	70
053	Hadong fisheries	5
076	Livestock disease control	62
077	Indochina agricultural	26
	Technical assistance	18
Industrial projects		2,323
101	Road building and repair	91
102	Cambodia river transportation	152
103	Cambodia river cargo handling	69
104	Cambodia road transportation	29
106	Cambodia water purification	34
107	Combodia port development	500
127	Laos road construction and repair	93
154	Vietnam portable electric power	190
155	Vietnam road construction and repair	895
177	Indochina municipal fire-fighting facilities	270
Public-health projects		3,170
201	Medical teams for prevention and treatment of disease	1,254
202	Pasteur Institute	1
203	Hospital maintenance and equipment	1,663
204	Drinking water program	43
210	General health activities	209
Other public services projects		569
301	Information service	226
302	Vietnam housing project	239
303	Vietnam Radio School	25
304	Vietnam radio broadcasting rehabilitation	75
306	Audio-visual	4

INDONESIAN REPUBLIC

Projects, grand total		96,026
Agricultural and fishery projects		1,951
97-F001	Fishing equipment, agricultural project	1,369
97-F002	Cambodian rice production equipment, agricultural project	1
97-F005	Indonesian forestry project	408
97-F006	Foot-and-mouth disease laboratory project	60
	Technical assistance	113

Industrial projects approved in the Far East as of June 30, 1951—Continued

INDONESIAN REPUBLIC—continued

		ECA-financed cost (thousands of dollars)
Industrial projects		1,334
97-N101	Engineering advisory services	700
97-N102	Textile industry rehabilitation	229
97-N103	Improvement of indigenous industries	400
	Technical assistance	5
Public health projects		2,741
97-H201	Medical teams for preventions and treatment of disease	681
97-H203	Hospital maintenance and equipment	1,960
97-H210	General health activities	100

PHILIPPINES

Projects, grand total		8,243
Agricultural and fishery projects		2,593
92-F001	Los Banos Agricultural College project	848
92-F002	Philippine irrigation project	700
92-F003	Philippine abacá research and development project	88
92-F004	Philippine soil survey and conservation project	154
92-F005	Philippine agricultural settlement project	70
92-F006	Philippine agricultural extension project	170
92-F007	Philippine coconut research and development project	77
92-F008	Philippine fiber (ramie and jute) research and development project	191
92-F009	Philippine animal product project	50
TA 92-F050-5	Project technicians for agricultural, fisheries, and forestry	245
Industrial projects		4,694
92-N101	Cottage industries	116
92-N102	Low-cost housing	573
92-N103	Specialized teachers' training	45
92-N104	Mining school rehabilitation	69
92-N105	Coal-mining survey	182
92-N106	Technical services for railroad survey	60
92-N107	Equipment for Iloco textile mill	160
92-N108	Program information project	50
92-N109	Mineral survey	136
92-N110	Public road construction	3,000
92-N111	Rehabilitation vocational schools	143
	Technical assistance	160
Public health projects		596
92-H201	Medical teams	405
92-H203	Hospital maintenance and equipment	91
92-H210	General health activities	50
92-H216	General educational activities	50
Other public services projects		360
Technical assistance		360

THAILAND

Projects, grand total		8,406
Agricultural and fishery projects		1,963
93-F001	Thailand irrigation development, agriculture project	946
93-F002	Agricultural research and education project	741
93-F003	Thailand fisheries project	69
	Technical assistance	207
Industrial projects		4,451
93-N101	Road building and repair	1,354
93-N102	Makassan railroad shop	901
93-N103	Mineral development project	588
93-N104	Harbor development	642
93-N106	Communications, planning, and development project	20
93-N112	Fish-freezing and processing survey	40
93-N113	Air transport development	335

Industrial projects approved in the Far East as of June 30, 1951—Continued

THAILAND—continued

	ECA-financed cost (thousands of dollars)
Industrial projects—Continued	
93-N114 Power rehabilitation and development project	417
Technical assistance	154
Public health projects	1,992
93-H201 Medical teams	716
93-H203 Hospital maintenance and equipment	607
93-H204 Drinking water	182
93-H205 Manufacture of pharmaceuticals	18
93-H208 Health nutrition	8
93-H210 General health activities	250
93-H213 Bangkok Medical School	25
Technical assistance	186

CHINA

Total	303
Agricultural and fishery projects:	
001 Operations of JCRS	303

Industrial projects approved in the Far East as of June 30, 1951—Continued

KOREA

	ECA-financed cost (thousands of dollars)
Projects, grand total	8,016
Industrial projects	8,016
89-N101 Coal-mining projects	1,135
89-N102 Power projects	1,500
89-N103 Power projects	1,544
89-N104 Power projects	1,003
89-N105 Railroad equipment projects	735
89-N106 Fishing vessels	2,099

Mr. WHERRY. We also financed a number of projects for strategic materials, in the amount of $51,592,000. They are classified in exhibit D. I ask unanimous consent that exhibit D be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the exhibit was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT D

Strategic materials projects in ERP countries, as of May 31, 1951

Country	Total commitments	5-percent counterpart funds	ECA
Belgium	$1,700,000		$1,700,000
Denmark	13,000		13,000
France	18,294,000	$11,344,000	6,950,000
Germany (Federal Republic)	6,765,000	6,765,000	
Greece	1,175,000	1,073,000	102,000
Italy	1,494,000	1,494,000	
Norway	265,000		265,000
Portugal	2,271,000	1,171,000	1,100,000
Turkey	195,000	61,000	134,000
United Kingdom	19,420,000	9,562,000	9,858,000
Total strategic materials projects	51,592,000	31,470,000	20,122,000

Mr. WHERRY. In addition to all this, we furnished technical assistance in connection with all projects, in the amount of $22,712,400. Those projects are classified in exhibit E. I ask unanimous consent that exhibit E be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, and also exhibit F which is a country breakdown of the use of ECA counterpart funds.

There being no objection, the exhibits were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT E

Technical assistance authorizations and expenditures, by field of activity, recipient country, and type of assistance cumulative through May 31, 1951

[Thousands of dollars]

Recipient country and type of assistance	Total		Field of activity							
			Industrial productivity		Agricultural productivity		Manpower utilization		Public administration	
	Authorizations	Expenditures	Authorizations	Expenditures	Authorizations	Expenditures	Authorizations	Expenditures	Authorizations	Expenditures
Total, all countries	22,712.4	[1] 11,682.2	10,155.8	4,693.3	3,719.3	1,838.0	2,421.8	878.9	2,224.8	1,415.8
United States experts	8,464.8	5,481.6	3,023.4	2,133.2	1,132.3	670.0	420.0	282.8	1,913.4	1,218.1
Foreign experts	8,789.9	[1] 5,627.4	3,924.1	2,356.2	1,834.1	1,005.4	510.7	389.5	310.5	197.7
Technical materials	2,605.9	125.4	2,376.4	118.9	225.9	6.4	.4		.9	
Basic surveys	1,392.6	233.2	382.8	23.4	517.0	154.9	490.8	54.9		
Services of international organizations	1,000.0	151.6					1,000.0	151.6		
Services of U. S. Government agencies	459.1	63.0	449.1	61.7	10.0	1.3				
Greece	7,373.0	4,852.3	2,671.9	1,885.9	1,103.2	551.8	466.0	316.3	1,755.0	1,171.1
United States experts	6,351.2	4,591.3	2,381.3	1,873.3	634.6	428.8	420.0	282.8	1,671.3	1,109.1
Foreign experts	400.9	189.6	15.6	12.6	122.6	51.5	46.0	33.5	83.7	62.0
Technical materials	275.0		275.0							
Basic surveys	346.0	71.4			346.0	71.4				
United Kingdom	2,906.8	1,355.6	2,497.2	1,175.1	127.3	60.6	12.3	8.6	1.6	1.1
United States experts	162.3	77.5	10.9	2.0	12.2	2.6				
Foreign experts	1,994.0	1,200.1	1,754.3	1,099.2	96.6	54.0	12.3	8.6	1.6	1.1
Technical materials	745.1	73.9	726.6	69.9	18.4	4.0				
Basic surveys	5.4	4.0	5.4	4.0						
Office of European Economic Cooperation	2,647.7	919.8	850.2	232.7	250.5	184.5	1,123.5	232.1	46.0	38.4
United States experts	67.5	36.7	9.7	.3	47.1	32.7			1.0	
Foreign experts	1,176.4	695.6	436.7	196.4	203.4	151.8	123.5	80.5	45.0	38.4
Technical materials [2]	250.0	18.8	250.0	18.8						
Services of international organizations	1,000.0	151.6					1,000.0	151.6		
Services of U. S. Government agencies	153.8	17.1	153.8	17.1						
France	2,459.0	1,168.7	1,686.6	682.4	207.7	130.3	94.5	72.5	4.3	3.3
United States experts	45.0		45.0							
Foreign experts	1,713.0	1,107.4	940.6	621.1	207.7	130.3	94.5	72.5	4.3	3.3
Technical materials	405.8	16.6	405.8	16.6						
Services of U. S. Government agencies	295.3	44.6	295.3	44.6						
Turkey	2,048.8	922.1	518.1	259.7	668.0	337.5			246.3	98.3
United States experts	1,220.4	503.7	459.1	222.3	325.4	122.9			148.7	73.8
Foreign experts	657.4	335.0	59.0	37.4	171.6	131.2			97.6	24.5
Basic surveys	171.0	83.5			171.0	83.5				

Footnotes at end of table.

Technical assistance authorizations and expenditures, by field of activity, recipient country, and type of assistance cumulative through May 31, 1951—Continued

[Thousands of dollars]

Recipient country and type of assistance	Total		Field of activity							
			Industrial productivity		Agricultural productivity		Manpower utilization		Public administration	
	Authorizations	Expenditures	Authorizations	Expenditures	Authorizations	Expenditures	Authorizations	Expenditures	Authorizations	Expenditures
Italy	1,244.2	209.1	370.4	22.4	122.3	72.9	456.4	22.0	99.0	43.8
United States experts	167.4	90.0			64.5	49.3			60.0	35.2
Foreign experts	338.8	117.6	81.6	22.3	47.8	22.3	20.6	22.0	9.0	8.6
Technical materials	75.7	.1	73.7	.1						
Basic surveys	652.3		215.0				435.8			
Services of U. S. Government agencies	10.0	1.3			10.0	1.3				
Denmark	693.6	199.0	300.7	72.3	330.6	88.4	10.8	9.3	4.1	2.4
United States experts	3.6	4.1								
Foreign experts	364.5	194.9	100.7	72.3	205.6	88.4	10.8	9.3	4.1	2.4
Technical materials	325.0		200.0		125.0					
Basic surveys	.5									
Germany (Federal Republic)	548.4	277.5	83.6	35.4	167.2	70.6	55.0	54.9	22.0	23.1
United States experts	123.6	103.1	3.0		40.6	25.9				
Foreign experts	356.5	118.9	80.6	35.4	113.3	44.1			22.0	23.1
Technical materials	13.3	.6			13.3	.6				
Basic surveys	55.0	54.9					55.0	54.9		
Norway	423.1	128.2	269.7	74.8	98.7	19.4	8.5	9.0		
United States experts	19.6	12.6	19.6	12.6						
Foreign experts	201.8	113.7	101.5	62.2	45.5	17.5	8.5	9.0		
Technical materials	201.7	1.9	148.5		53.2	1.9				
Austria	420.0	74.1	296.7	26.2	55.7	29.0	33.1	19.8	.9	
United States experts	15.7	15.5	11.6	11.3						
Foreign experts	134.3	58.6	32.1	14.9	40.3	20.0	32.7	19.8		
Technical materials	270.0		253.0		15.4		.4		.9	
Netherlands	400.0	239.5	126.0	82.9	136.1	72.3	23.0	22.4	3.0	1.5
United States experts	7.0	.3	4.3	.3						
Foreign experts	393.1	239.2	121.7	82.6	136.1	72.3	23.0	22.4	3.0	1.5
Ireland	354.3	133.7	179.9	15.2	72.9	36.5			8.4	7.7
United States experts	95.2	38.9	66.2	11.1						
Foreign experts	151.1	94.7	5.8	4.1	72.9	36.5			8.4	7.7
Technical materials	8.0	.1	7.9							
Basic surveys	100.0		100.0							
Belgium-Luxemburg	304.7	82.0	107.2	58.2	11.1	7.3	13.2	7.9	1.0	
United States experts	168.8	2.3	10.0		2.3	2.3				
Foreign experts	103.5	60.3	64.8	38.8	8.9	5.0	13.2	7.9	1.0	
Basic surveys	32.4	19.4	32.4	19.4						
Sweden	131.0	70.7	53.3	39.7	25.6	11.5	17.5	17.2	.5	.5
United States experts	2.7		2.7							
Foreign experts	128.3	70.7	50.5	39.7	25.6	11.5	17.5	17.2	.5	.5
Iceland	64.1	25.2	39.6	15.5	20.2	9.7			2.3	
United States experts	7.9	5.5			5.6	5.5			2.3	
Foreign experts	19.8	6.4	3.7	2.2	14.0	4.2				
Technical materials	36.4	13.3	35.8	13.3	.6					
Trieste	30.0		30.0							
Basic surveys	30.0		30.0							
Portugal	20.9	5.8			4.2	2.5			5.0	3.1
United States experts	7.0									
Foreign experts	13.9	5.8			4.2	2.5			5.0	3.1
United States Government agencies	642.8	332.5	74.7	15.0	318.1	162.3	108.0	86.9	25.4	21.6
Foreign experts	642.8	332.5	74.7	15.0	318.1	162.3	108.0	86.9	25.4	21.6

[1] Including $686.4 thousand expenditures from "Program management" not distributed by country.
[2] Including $47.0 thousand authorizations, $18.8 thousand expenditures transferred from U. S. Government agencies.

NOTE.—Totals shown are sums of unrounded figures, hence may vary slightly from totals of rounded amounts.
Source: Office of the Controller and Technical Assistance Division, Reports and Analysis Branch, Division of Statistics and Reports, July 10, 1951.

Technical assistance authorizations and expenditures, by field of activity, recipient country, and type of assistance cumulative through May 31, 1951—Continued

[Thousands of dollars]

Recipient country and type of assistance	Field of activity									
	Transportation and communications		Marketing		Development of overseas territories		Tourism		Program management	
	Authorizations	Expenditures	Authorizations	Expenditures	Authorizations	Expenditures	Authorizations	Expenditures	Authorizations	Expenditures
Total, all countries	2,010.6	1,239.4	464.6	274.0	393.5	115.3	187.8	140.2	1,134.3	[1] 1,037.3
United States experts	1,297.7	860.4	286.1	183.9	306.8	71.4	85.1	61.8		
Foreign experts	712.6	379.0	174.9	90.1	86.2	43.9	102.7	78.5	1,134.3	[1] 1,037.3
Technical materials	.3		2.1	.1						
Basic surveys			1.5		.5					
Services of international organizations										
Services of U. S. Government agencies										
Greece	999.4	718.3	279.7	170.4			42.0	28.3	55.7	10.3
United States experts	939.1	698.6	262.8	170.4			42.0	28.3		
Foreign experts	60.3	19.7	16.9						55.7	10.3
Technical materials										
Basic surveys										
United Kingdom	9.3	7.0	22.1	18.0	133.1	67.9	2.2		101.7	17.2
United States experts			10.1	7.2	129.2	65.7				
Foreign experts	9.3	7.0	12.0	10.8	3.9	2.2	2.2		101.7	17.2
Technical materials										
Basic surveys										
Office of European Economic Cooperation	192.7	140.5	18.3	11.0	5.0	1.6	70.0	53.9	91.6	25.2
United States experts			4.8	2.0	5.0	1.6				
Foreign experts	192.7	140.5	13.5	9.0			70.0	53.9	91.6	25.2
Technical materials										
Services of international organizations										
Services of U. S. Government agencies										
France	22.7	3.6	37.0	33.1	68.7	36.1			337.6	207.5
United States experts										
Foreign experts	22.7	3.6	37.0	33.1	68.7	36.1			337.6	207.5
Technical materials										
Services of U. S. Government agencies										
Turkey	523.1	218.7					8.5		84.8	7.9
United States experts	278.7	84.6					8.5			
Foreign experts	244.5	134.1							84.8	7.9
Basic surveys										
Italy	62.7	25.0	10.5	4.6	5.5		5.6	5.6	111.8	12.8
United State experts			1.8		5.5		5.6	5.6		
Foreign experts	62.7	25.0	5.2	4.6					111.8	12.8
Technical materials			2.0							
Basic surveys			1.5							
Services of U. S. Government agencies										
Denmark	9.4	7.5	10.2	8.2	4.1	4.1			23.6	6.7
United State experts					3.6	4.1				
Foreign experts	9.4	7.5	10.2	8.2					23.6	6.7
Technical materials										
Basic surveys					.5					
Germany (Federal Republic)	99.3	81.0	25.3	3.1					96.0	9.4
United States experts	80.0	77.2								
Foreign experts	19.3	3.8	25.3	3.1					96.0	9.4
Technical materials										
Basic surveys										
Norway	4.0	2.1							42.2	22.9
United States experts										
Foreign experts	4.0	2.1							42.2	22.9
Technical materials										
Austria	.3		4.1	4.2					29.2	3.9
United States experts			4.1	4.2						
Foreign experts									29.2	3.0
Technical materials	.3									
Netherlands			2.6		3.7	1.9			105.7	58.5
United States experts			2.6							
Foreign experts					3.7	1.9			105.7	58.5
Ireland	21.1	14.6	.1	.1			59.5	52.5	12.5	7.2
United States experts							29.0	27.9		
Foreign experts	21.1	14.6					30.5	24.6	12.5	7.2
Technical materials			.1	.1						
Basic surveys										

[1] Including $686.4 thousand expenditures for "Program management" not distributed by country.

Technical assistance authorizations and expenditures, by field of activity, recipient country, and type of assistance cumulative through May 31, 1951—Continued

[Thousands of dollars]

Recipient country and type of assistance	Field of activity									
	Transportation and communications		Marketing		Development of overseas territories		Tourism		Program management	
	Authorizations	Expenditures	Authorizations	Expenditures	Authorizations	Expenditures	Authorizations	Expenditures	Authorizations	Expenditures
Belgium-Luxemburg			1.5		166.4	3.7			4.3	4.9
United States experts					156.5					
Foreign experts			1.5		9.9	3.7			4.3	4.9
Basic surveys										
Sweden	2.0	1.9	8.8						23.4	
United States experts										
Foreign experts	2.0	1.9	8.8						23.4	
Iceland									2.1	
United States experts										
Foreign experts									2.1	
Technical materials										
Trieste										
Basic surveys										
Portugal					7.0				4.7	.2
United States experts					7.0					
Foreign experts									4.7	.2
U. S. Government agencies	64.7	19.1	44.5	21.3					7.4	6.4
Foreign experts	64.7	19.1	44.5	21.3					7.4	6.4

NOTE.—Totals shown are sums of unrounded figures, hence may vary slightly from totals of rounded amounts.
Source: Office of the Controller and Technical Assistance Division, Reports and Analysis Branch, Division of Statistics and Reports, July 10, 1951.

EXHIBIT F

Status of ECA counterpart funds as of May 31, 1952

[United States dollars matched by local currency available for country projects]

Country	Total approved for withdrawal (dollar equivalents)	Total withdrawn (dollar equivalents)
	Millions	*Millions*
Austria	$419.6	$410.3
Belgium-Luxemburg	2.2	2.1
Denmark	118.8	118.8
France	2,220.7	2,220.7
Germany (Federal Republic)	842.5	841.5
Greece	313.1	298.5
Italy	720.7	598.8
Netherlands	270.9	270.9
Norway	200.9	200.9
Iceland	.9	.9
Portugal	15.4	12.0
Turkey	34.2	34.2
Trieste	25.6	25.3
United Kingdom	1,610.4	1,610.4
Total use of counterpart funds as of May 31, 1951	6,795.9	6,645.3

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it should be noted that this does not include the financing of the point 4 programs. I am not sure as to the total number of millions we have spent for such programs up to this time. I am speaking only of ECA countries or their colonies; also the industrial projects in the Far East; and the technical assistance which we have rendered in connection with such projects.

The ECA-financed projects total $757,787,400, out of the $12,000,000,000. That is the figure up until now. We do not know what the commitments are beyond this time.

In addition, ERP countries have had available in counterpart funds which have been approved for withdrawal, $6,795,900,000 as of May 31, 1951. Counterpart funds are ECA dollars translated into local currency. We furnish the materials paid for by American dollars, and the ERP countries charge their people for them. The local currency is paid into the counterpart fund. Withdrawals from that fund are used in addition to the direct ECA-financed costs on projects, as represented by the $757,787,400.

Mr. President, the ECA report on the status of local currency counterpart funds as of May 31, 1951, showed that the $6,795,900,000 represents actual ECA dollars which have been spent for materials and services furnished to the recipient countries.

The foreign government or private industry in the foreign country pays for the materials and services in local currency, which goes into the counterpart fund account of the particular country. The foreign government may withdraw the counterpart funds, upon approval of the ECA, for projects within the country or in its overseas dependencies. The foreign government thus benefits twofold in the process. The United States does not receive any return on ECA dollars thus invested, except for 5 percent set aside from counterpart funds, which ECA may use for the purchase or development of strategic materials in that country.

Mr. President, that is a rather short and brief but complete picture of what we are doing for industrial projects overseas.

I also asked my assistant to prepare a breakdown of those industrial projects, approved and ECA financed, which are for agricultural production, reclamation, transportation, communications, power, waterways, harbors, and so forth. We selected those out of the total project tabulations which I have just placed in the RECORD.

For projects in ERP countries in Europe, ECA has financed the cost to the extent of $181,133,000. That is just the start of the projects, up to and including June 30, 1951.

I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table which I have marked "Exhibit A." It is headed "Industrial projects approved in ERP countries (in Europe)."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT A

Industrial projects approved in ERP countries (in Europe) (for purposes of agricultural production, reclamation, transportation, irrigation, power, water, waterways and harbors) as of June 30, 1951, by country and type of project

	Thousands of dollars, ECA-financed costs
Denmark:	
Power facilities	5,070
Greece:	
Power facilities	22,375
Engineering and technical studies	2,000
Iceland:	
Power facilities	5,065
France:	
Power facilities	20,930
Communications	1,290
Air transport	9,311
Irrigation and reclamation	1,400
Italy:	
Power facilities	62,667
Air transport	4,500
Netherlands:	
Power facilities	3,372
Portugal:	
Air transport	1,037
Fishery fleet	700
Irrigation and reclamation	2,100
Turkey:	
Power facilities	15,020
Air transport	712
Roads	16,060
Railroads and equipment	1,000
Waterways and harbors	5,324
Engineering and technical studies	660
International:	
Power facilities (Austro-German hydro power plant)	540
Total projects in ERP countries in Europe, for agricultural production, reclamation, roads, etc	181,133

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I refer now to projects in overseas territories of ERP countries. The ECA-financed cost is $63,791,000.

I ask unanimous consent that the table marked "Exhibit B" be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. It is headed "Industrial projects in overseas territories of ERP countries."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT B

Industrial projects in overseas territories of ERP countries (for purposes of agricultural production, reclamation, transportation, irrigation, power, water, waterways, and harbors) as of June 30, 1951

	ECA-financed cost
Territories of the United Kingdom:	
Fiscal year 1950	$1,235,000
Fiscal year 1951	11,078,000
Territories of France:	
Fiscal year 1950	4,116,000
Fiscal year 1951	27,992,000
Territories of the Netherlands:	
Fiscal year 1951	1,448,000
Territories of Belgium:	
Fiscal year 1950	1,718,000
Fiscal year 1951	15,541,000
Territory of Portugal: Fiscal year 1951	$663,000
Total overseas territories projects	[1] 63,791,000

[1] This total is same as that shown in summary of all projects. All of the projects in overseas territories are for agricultural production, reclamation, transportation, etc.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the same types of projects in the Far East program are costing $42,302,000.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the table which I have marked "Exhibit C." It is headed "Industrial projects approved in the Far East."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT C

Industrial projects approved in the Far East (for purposes of agricultural production, reclamation, transportation, irrigation, power, water, waterways, and harbors) as of June 30, 1951, by country and type of project

	Thousands of dollars, ECA-financed costs
Burma:	
Agriculture and fishing	1,241
Industrial projects (nonmanufacturing)	4,588
Formosa (Taiwan):	
Agriculture and fishing	100
Industrial projects (nonmanufacturing)	7,989
Indochina, Associated States:	
Agriculture and fishing	756
Industrial projects (nonmanufacturing)	2,323
Indonesian Republic:	
Agriculture and fishing	1,951
Industrial projects (nonmanufacturing)	1,334
Philippines:	
Agriculture and fishing	2,593
Industrial projects (nonmanufacturing)	4,694
Thailand:	
Agriculture and fishing	1,963
Industrial projects (nonmanufacturing)	4,451
China: Agriculture and fishing	303
Korea: Industrial projects (nonmanufacturing)	8,016
Total Far East projects for purposes of agricultural and fishing production, power, transportation, communications, reclamation, irrigation, waterways, and harbors, etc	42,302

Mr. WHERRY. On top of it all, Mr. President, there are technical assistance authorizations for various purposes, costing $7,123,400. They are set forth in exhibit D. I ask unanimous consent that the table headed "Technical assistance authorizations," and so forth, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT D

Technical assistance authorizations chargeable to agricultural production, reclamation, irrigation, transportation, communications, power, water, waterways, and harbors, as of May 31, 1951

[Thousands of dollars]

Country	Agricultural production	Transportation, communications, power, etc.	Development of overseas territories
Greece	1,103.2	999.4	
United Kingdom	127.3	9.3	133.1
OEEC	250.5	192.7	5.0
France	207.7	22.7	68.7
Turkey	668.0	523.1	
Italy	122.3	62.7	5.5
Denmark	350.6	9.4	4.1
Germany (Federal Republic)	107.2	99.3	
Norway	98.7	4.0	
Austria	55.7	.3	
Netherlands	136.1		3.7
Ireland	72.9	21.1	
Belgium-Luxemburg	11.1		166.4
Sweden	25.6	2.0	
Iceland	20.2		
Portugal	4.2		7.0
U. S. Government agencies	318.1	64.7	
Total technical assistance authorizations	3,719.3	2,010.6	303.5
Grand total		6,123.4	

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed exhibit E, headed "ECA counterpart fund available for agricultural production, reclamation, transportation, irrigation, power, water, waterways and harbors, communications."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT E

ECA counterpart funds available (for agricultural production, reclamation, transportation, irrigation, power, water, waterways and harbors, communications) as of May 31, 1951, by country

	Total withdrawn (dollar equivalents) (millions of dollars)
Austria	118.0
Belgium-Luxemburg	2.1
Denmark	26.9
France	1,009.4
Germany (Federated Republic)	229.1
Greece	54.8
Italy	521.5
Netherlands	180.6
Iceland	.9
Portugal	15.4
Turkey	34.2
Trieste	25.3
United Kingdom	1.2
Total counterpart funds used for agricultural, reclamation, transportation, irrigation, power, etc	3,961.7

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the total direct ECA cost in dollars in agricultural production, reclamation, irrigation, transportation, communications, power, waterways and harbors, since the

program got under way in 1949, up to and including May 31, 1951, is $294,349,400.

In addition, ERP countries have available in counterpart funds, which have been approved for agricultural projects, reclamation, power, roads, and so forth, $3,961,700,000.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator wish to make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MOODY. I should like to make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WHERRY. I will say to the Senator from Michigan that we have had some debate on the program which is before us. My feeling is that if appropriations aggregating $107,000,000,000 for 1952 are to come before the Senate, we had better make cuts that will include the foreign aid programs. To me it seems a sad commentary upon the membership of the United States Senate that we are giving such grave consideration to reductions in vital programs at home, while billions of dollars continue to flow unchecked to projects overseas. I am not discussing the merits of those projects. If we are to make cuts in reclamation and similar projects in our country, we should begin by making reductions in funds given to foreign countries for such purposes.

In fact, I think we should cut foreign projects entirely, before one essential project in the United States of America should suffer a reduction.

(At this point Mr. WHERRY yielded to Mr. MOODY, who addressed the Senate on the subject of beef slaughtering quotas, and debate ensued, all of which, on request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent was ordered to be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of his speech.)

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. In 3 minutes; I will yield to the majority leader. Mr. President, I always desire to go along with the majority leader because, after all, the responsibility of running the Senate rests on his shoulders.

I have referred to these appropriations and to the ECA, not for the purpose of discussing the merits of the ECA program and appropriations, but because I wished to call attention as forcibly as I could to the staggering appropriations which are confronting the Members of the Senate. As I read them, they will total over $100,000,000,000. It makes no difference how worthy they are. I charge no Senator with insincerity. I think a Senator can be just as sincere in favoring one of these projects as a Senator who wishes to reduce the appropriations for a project. I have no quarrel with any Senator on that score. In fact, I never felt better toward the Senate in my life than I do this afternoon.

I point out, however, to the members of the Appropriations Committee that we are facing terrific appropriations. Although no doubt we will be criticized for some of the cuts we will make, I say we will make them anyway and take the criticism.

However, I am appealing now to Senators who have voted to cut the appropriations for essential projects at home, but who do not vote to cut the appropriations for projects abroad. If we are to make cuts, I think we should make the cuts straight across the board, so that the American taxpayers may benefit from domestic programs at least in the same way people in foreign countries are benefited by projects made possible by our foreign aid gifts throughout the world.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Nevada, who has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. In a moment.

In fact, I should yield first to the majority leader, because I believe he wishes to propound a unanimous-consent request. I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], the majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has said that he wishes to have us make progress in handling the agricultural appropriation bill. I believe the best way to do that is by means of a unanimous-consent agreement.

I have spoken to Senators on both sides of the aisle, and they tell me that they have concluded debating the pending amendment. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the Senator from Nebraska concludes his remarks, debate on the pending amendment be limited to 10 minutes, and on each and every other amendment, motion or appeal, to 30 minutes to a side, with the time to be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents, and to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] or any Senator whom he may designate, provided the Senator from Georgia favors the amendment. If not, then that the time be divided between the proponent of the amendment and the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. And further that debate on the final passage of the bill be limited to one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. WHERRY. What about additional amendments?

Mr. McFARLAND. Thirty minutes would be allowed.

Mr. WHERRY. On any amendment?

Mr. McFARLAND. On any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not sure that 10 minutes is sufficient on the pending amendment. There are one or two Senators who wanted to speak. They are not present. Could the Senator make the time 20 minutes, 10 minutes to a side?

Mr. McFARLAND. Ample time would be allowed on the bill itself.

Mr. WHERRY. I am referring to the pending amendment. Could the Senator make the time on it 20 minutes, 10 minutes to a side?

Mr. McFARLAND. I spoke to the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I tried to contact all interested Senators.

Mr. WHERRY. Would only 5 minutes to each side be allowed on the pending amendment?

Mr. McFARLAND. Five minutes would be allowed to each side.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have no objection to the unanimous-consent request, except that I want to make a few remarks tonight on a subject related to the bill, and I do not want to be precluded from doing so.

Mr. McFARLAND. Let me say to my good friend from Delaware, I had thought that if we could obtain a limitation of debate, we could get a vote on the pending amendment and probably one or two others, and we would then quit around 6:30 or 6:45; and, if the Senator wanted to make some remarks then, after we conclude, we would certainly arrange for him to do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wanted to speak now. It would not require very many minutes. Perhaps the unanimous-consent agreement could be made afterward.

Mr. McFARLAND. How much time does the Senator want?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, how much time did the Senator from Arizona request on the pending amendment?

Mr. McFARLAND. Ten minutes, 5 minutes on a side.

Mr. RUSSELL. So far as I am concerned, I should be glad to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Delaware, the 5 minutes which would be mine on the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. May I inquire of the Senator from Delaware whether 10 minutes would be sufficient?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That would be sufficient.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, very well; it is agreeable, except that it is understood that the Senator from Delaware is to have the 10 minutes on the pending amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have stated I would yield him 5 minutes on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I assume the agreement includes motions.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; I included motions and appeals.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I did not hear the Senator say that.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, I included them.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That during the further consideration of H. R. 3973, the Agricultural Department appropriation bill, 1952, debate upon any amendment or motion (including appeals) shall be limited to not exceeding 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled, in the case of committee amendments, by Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. WHERRY, respectively, or some Senator designated by him; and, in the case of individual amendments or motions, by the mover of any such amendment or motion and Mr. RUSSELL, respectively: *Provided*, That in the event Mr. RUSSELL is in favor of any such individual motion or amendment, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by Mr. WHERRY, or some Senator designated by him.

Ordered further, That debate on the question of the final passage of the said bill shall be limited to not exceeding 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. WHERRY, or some Senator designated by him.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Has the Senator from Nebraska concluded? This was to be done at the conclusion of his address.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand the Senator from Nebraska his finished.

Mr. DIRKSEN. He started to yield to me, and I then yielded for the purpose of permitting the unanimous-consent request to be made. I did not know whether he had concluded his remarks.

Mr. McFARLAND. He has concluded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will inquire whether the Senator from Nebraska has concluded his remarks.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if anyone feels that I have not made myself clear, I shall be glad to take another 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest that the Senator take 1 minute.

Mr. WHERRY. I think I should yield, if I may, to the two Senators who were first on their feet. We have concluded action on the unanimous-consent request, have we not?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the two Senators who have been on their feet, apparently desiring to propound a question to the Senator from Nebraska, shall be permitted to do so. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I simply want to say to my distinguished leader from Nebraska that I shall be ready to help him on these foreign aid appropriations, and they will receive the best kind of scrutiny which my talent and ability are capable. The hatchet will be very sharp, and I shall be ready to proceed.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his statement. I did not mean to imply that the Senator did not intend to cut straight across the board and to include foreign aid. I appreciate his observation.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. As a preface to the question, did the Senator say that it was approximately $4,000,000,000 which had been expended in projects in Europe from ECA funds?

Mr. WHERRY. That is the total amount which has been made available for reclamation and similar purposes in direct ECA payments and out of counterpart funds.

Mr. MALONE. I mean for all projects.

Mr. WHERRY. All projects total over $757,000,000, in direct ECA costs, and more than $6,795,000,000 counterpart funds.

Mr. MALONE. That is $7,000,000,000 altogether, is it not?

Mr. WHERRY. It exceeds that. Of course, there are those who will say, "These are counterpart funds"; but the point I want to make is that, to my mind, the people of the ECA countries would never have authorized those projects and paid for them for the purposes for which they are intended. They receive the counterpart funds from the steel which goes into the projects, and to me those counterpart funds are related to dollars, and those dollars all go into this pool, and they pay for these reclamation projects.

Mr. MALONE. The counterpart funds are secured through the sale of the materials given to Europe by the taxpayers of America; is that correct?

Mr. WHERRY. I want to answer the question by reading this memorandum, because I want it exactly correct:

The $6,795,000,000 represents the actual ECA dollars which have been spent for materials and services furnished to the recipient countries. The foreign government or the private industry in the foreign country pays for the materials and services in local currency, which goes into the counterpart fund account of that particular country. The foreign government may withdraw counterpart funds upon approval of ECA for all projects within the country or its overseas dependencies.

So they take these funds, and they pay for these projects out of ECA dollar counterpart funds.

Mr. MALONE. If the Senator will yield further, it is well known that we have gift-loaned tremendous amounts of money to the Central and South American countries for projects such as steel mills, reclamation projects, and projects of various other types, and that Mexico and some Central and South American countries are at the present time seeking a large amount of additional money with which to build irrigation and other projects.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him there?

Mr. MALONE. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Those projects, if the Senator from Nevada cares to look them up, were reported by the junior Senator from Nebraska last year. We have not made a report on them this year. They come out of the Inter-American Fund to those separate countries, and they are not included at all in these figures.

Mr. MALONE. Yes; I understand that. I am talking now about the total amount coming out of the taxpayers of the United States of America. Whether they come out of inter-American funds, the ECA, point 4, gift-loans by the World Bank or the Export-Import Bank, the funds are all composed of American taxpayers' money are they not?

Mr. WHERRY. That is true.

Mr. MALONE. Then, let us look at it this way. We know that it amounts to a total of $8,000,000,000 or $9,000,000,000, perhaps $10,000,000,000 since ECA started we know also that we have gift-loaned more than $41,000,000,000 since World War II to foreign nations of the world. The question is this: Within the past few days a number of Senators, including myself, have viewed the Missouri, Kansas, and Mississippi River floods. We left here by plane on Saturday noon to visit the stricken areas in Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma. We returned, arriving in Washington, D. C., at 5 a. m. Tuesday morning. During that time we visited St. Louis and the Mississippi River flood area for about 200 miles down that river. In Kansas City, Mo., and Kansas City, Kans., we viewed the industrial areas and those areas were in the main completely wiped out. We visited Wichita and down into Oklahoma, at the confluence of the Arkansas River and the Neosho River. It is estimated that the total loss will probably be upward of $1,000,000,000, in this entire area for this one flood, all of which could have been prevented by an expenditure on the Kaw River and the Missouri River, of approximately $600,000,000 on the projects which had been approved by the Public Works Committee of the United States Senate, and by the Ways and Means Committee of the House, passed by the Congress and signed by the President, from 1936, we may say, until 1950.

Those projects necessary to have stopped the flood have been held up by the budget committee. The projects so delayed by the budget committee include the dam on Tuttle Creek, a tributary of the Kaw River, and others which have been outlined in detail by the Army engineers each year in their estimates for the budget director.

If those projects had been constructed on schedule as intended by the Congress of the United States, and not held up by the Bureau of the Budget, there would have been no loss of life or property in the Missouri Valley or in the Kaw River Valley, or this year the two rivers would have been controlled. Those statements were made by the Army engineers on our trip.

We saw the devastated area.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nebraska whether he thinks it more important to carry on in the manner we have carried on, and divert all the funds, six or seven billion dollars, to Europe, and which add up to more than $40,000,000,000, to foreign countries outside the United States since World War II, or whether it would be better to take care of the investments inside the United States first, and perhaps have a point 4 program for the

devastated areas in the United States of America?

Mr. WHERRY. I am strongly in favor of keeping the home fires burning, as the Senator from Nevada knows. I did not rise to discuss the merits of ECA projects. I simply rose to show the amount of money we have put into projects in ECA countries, and how we have continued to finance them, apparently, on a 100-percent basis, when at home we have been cutting the very projects about to which the Senator from Nevada has referred. I should like to say for the RECORD that the figure of $8,000,000,000, $9,000,000,000, or $10,000,000,000 is inclusive of all industrial projects.

Mr. MALONE. That is, outside of the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. The figure we should consider is about $4,000,000,000, because that is the amount which will actually be spent with American dollars and with counterpart funds in ECA countries for the purposes indicated, namely, reclamation projects, dams, roads, power, and so forth.

Mr. MALONE. Then the expenditure of perhaps 15 percent of that amount in the area which I have just described would have prevented $800,000,000 or $900,000,000 or a billion dollars worth of damage.

If the Senator from Nebraska will yield further, I should like to say that we have been blackmailed by European nations since World War II saying "We will go Communist unless you pay the bills."

The Senator from Nevada has listened to the little people in Kansas Citys, Kans. and Mo., and St. Louis, Mo., in Wichita, Kans., and in Oklahoma, who have described in detail how their homes and their small business enterprises have been swept away, and who want to rehabilitate themselves. Some of them had unpaid mortgages on their homes. Those people had a look of pride on their faces because they are citizens of the United States of America and want to work and earn their way.

Is it not better to assist some of our own people who are really hurt and hold their confidence in the United States of America, and stop submitting to blackmail by foreign countries.

The President of the United States has submitted a budget of more than $70,000,000,000 to Congress—$8,500,000,000 for foreign nations the principals of which have recognized Communist China while our boys fight their hearts out against them.

One third of the $8,500,000,000 will complete flood control and irrigation in this country and bolster our domestic economy.

Is it not time we took cognizance of that fact and used a little common sense.

BEEF SLAUGHTERING QUOTAS

During the delivery of Mr. WHERRY's speech,

Mr. MOODY. I should like to call attention for a moment to a situation which I think adds to the dangers of inflation. When we passed the price-control bill the Senate removed authority from the bill to impose quotas on slaughtering. At that time, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] termed the amendment the "black market" amendment. At about the same time Mr. DiSalle said that it would undermine his efforts to control prices on meat.

Today, as the conference committee is meeting on the defense production bill, I received two telegrams and a letter from Detroit packing houses. They are comparatively small packing houses.

I ask that the telegrams and letter to which I have referred be printed in full in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

DETROIT, MICH., *July 25, 1951.*

Senator BLAIR MOODY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The life of the independent beef slaughterers rests in your immediate decision to retain slaughtering quotas. If quotas are removed, there will definitely be chaos in our industry.

VICTORY PACKING CO.

DETROIT, MICH., *July 25, 1951.*

Senator BLAIR MOODY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As slaughterers of cattle in Detroit, we believe it imperative to price program OPS retained authority to impose slaughter quotas. Our experience during last program and present facts convince us that uncontrolled slaughtering without registrations and quotas would shortly result in complete disruption and unenforceability of any contemplated and essential price-control program. Later imposition of such necessary restraints after interruption would create hopeless confusion and difficulty of enforcement.

STANDARD BEEF CO.

EXHIBIT 2

K. SHAPIRO, INC.,
Detroit, Mich., July 23, 1951.

Hon. BLAIR MOODY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to protest against any action which will eliminate the quota program of the slaughter of livestock for the following reasons:

1. It insures sufficient production of meat.
2. It insures adequate sanitary and hygienic standards.
3. It guarantees the elimination of diversion of meat products into the black market.
4. Through keeping the flow of meat in legitimate channels, it guarantees that the Government will receive its proper revenue from this production.
5. Since the tax program provides for the siphoning of excess profits, it will keep prices in line, consistent with a satisfactory return to the farmer, the packer, and the consumer.
6. For price control to be effective, we must of necessity have quota control.

We have been in business for the past 35 years.

We operate under Federal inspection, USDA, No. 934, and undor normal conditions for the past 10 years have killed approximately 5,000 animals per week.

We trust and hope that Congress will not destroy the economy of the meat business.

Yours very truly,

K. SHAPIRO, INC.,
A. B. CHAPMAN.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, first I wish to speak about the telegram. I do not believe that slaughtering controls have anything to do with the shortage of meat supply to independent packers. I do not believe that the removal of slaughtering quotas from the packing houses will cause a reduction in the supply of meat. On the contrary I believe it will increase the supply of meat.

What we want is more meat, not less meat. If we are going to have more meat, we must make sure that the meat reaches the central packers and the licensed packers, because if they do not get it, the black-market operators will. If the meat does not reach the licensed operators or the central markets, then the independent nonslaughterers will begin to wonder where their meat supply will come from.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MOODY. The Senator is well informed about the situation, and so am I. I think the position of the small slaughterers should be considered.

Mr. WHERRY. I have made my living from feeding cattle. I know what the cattle feeders and the producers of cattle think about the situation.

When any Senator stands on the floor of the Senate and says that the removal of slaughtering quotas depresses the market and is responsible for the price increases that throw the small operators out of the market, he simply has not had any experience with feeding cattle and getting them to market. The moment slaughtering quotas are imposed, once again the slaughterers are allowed to kill only a certain number of cattle during 1 day, or within a certain period, regardless of supply.

Why not let a slaughterer buy all the cattle he wants to buy and increase the supply on the meat counters?

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Someone said the other day, "I do not want to go back to the soup lines of the Hoover days." Mr. President, I do not want to go back to the black-market days.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall yield in a moment. This is a big subject, but the Senator has raised it.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to answer the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan is a newspaperman, and newspapermen always like to talk. However, I am just a farmer and a country lawyer, but I am talking my heart out about this matter, because I know the truth of the situation.

Mr. MOODY. If any newspaperman likes to talk more than the Senator does, I should like to meet him. I shall be glad to debate the question with him.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan is very ambitious, and that is quite all right. I shall be glad to debate with the Senator on any platform in the United States at some other time, but I should like to remain here now and do my duty in the Senate. I should like to do what I can to have this agricultural appropriation bill passed.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall yield to the Senator from Arizona in a moment. I am glad to yield to the majority leader at any time.

However, first I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that if we permit meat to flow normally in the regular markets, which are licensed markets, the supply of meat can be controlled and enforced just as effectively as it is being controlled by unrealistic slaughtering quotas.

Those who feel that the removal of slaughtering quotas will cause a decrease in the supply of meat, to my mind are mistaken. I believe that restricting the numbers of cattle a licensed slaughterer can kill will be a deterrent to cattle production, or it will force the excess normal production—over and above the quota that is permitted the licensed slaughterer—into the black market, where prices cannot be controlled, or any other benefits derived in the slaughtering process.

I have not received any telegrams in opposition, but only telegrams of commendation, from the packers in my State. I have received no criticism of my statement in regard to the removal of the quotas.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MOODY. If the Senator wishes to read a telegram in which that protest is made, let the Senator read the one I have in my hand.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator can place the telegram in the RECORD.

Mr. MOODY. Certainly; that is what I have done.

Mr. WHERRY. However, a statement in one telegram does not make it so; and simply because Mr. DiSalle says it is so, does not make it so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the Senator from Nebraska will not regard my query as impertinent.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no; I never do. The Senator from Illinois is never impertinent. I know that he is always sincere and always speaks to the subject.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What I shall say now relates to the subject. When the Senator from Nebraska said he was a country boy, it occurred to me that it is also true, is it not, that the Senator from Nebraska has had the advantage of a very superior Harvard education?

Mr. WHERRY. I went to Harvard for 1 year and one-half, before the days of Felix Frankfurter, if the Senator wishes to know. [Laughter.]

I guess that answers the question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to my distinguished friend, the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Nebraska knows the respect I have for him.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. However, I did not like one thing the Senator said concerning the Senator from Michigan, because I love the Senators.

Mr. WHERRY. What was that?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Nebraska accused the Senator from Michigan of being a newspaperman.

Mr. WHERRY. I said he was a newspaperman. I did not accuse him of anything.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not true that the Senator from Michigan took the same oath of office that the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from New Mexico and all other Senators took, and is a United States Senator, with all the obligations and duties and responsibilities that any other Senator has?

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. I did not speak disrespectfully of the Senator from Michigan, and I did not intend to speak in such a way. I said he was a newspaperman. I said I had grown up in the cattle-feeding business; I said I am a country lawyer and that I think I know something about the meat business.

I thought I was complimenting the Senator from Michigan when I said he was a newspaperman. If that is not a compliment, at least I say now that I intended it to be a compliment.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I really mean that, Mr. President.

Mr. MOODY. I am sure the Senator does.

Mr. WHERRY. I knew the Senator from Michigan when he was a master of ceremonies on a radio program, and he would get me to help put on a show.

Mr. MOODY. Yes; and the Senator from Nebraska did, too, just as he is doing now.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall be glad to accept another invitation.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that I shall seek recognition tomorrow in order to make a brief statement as to why it is very important not to reduce the amount contemplated for the Mutual Assistance Security Act, namely, the implementation of the North Atlantic Pact.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will advise the Senator that under the unanimous-consent agreement just entered into, until the present bill is completed the time will be controlled. The time is already under control with reference to the following bill.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LODGE. Is it not in order to offer an amendment and speak on the amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. I may have to do that.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I say that on all additional amendments there will be 30 minutes' time allowed, 15 minutes to a side; so I am quite sure that if the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts feels that he should make his speech tomorrow afternoon, he may offer an amendment, or he can take up the matter with those who control the time on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Massachusetts will not offer an amendment for the purpose of speaking, because that would be really in violation of the unanimous-consent agreement. If that is not done, I think we should complete the bill by at least 4 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have some facts which I obtained in Paris which have a direct bearing on one of the most important pieces of legislation with which we are faced at this time, and I think it is important to get the facts before the Senate. It will not take more than 10 or 15 minutes. I want to cooperate, but I think this is a timely and proper thing for me to do. I do not think I am being unreasonable.

Mr. McFARLAND. I would never accuse the Senator from Massachusetts of being unreasonable, but I do not like to violate the spirit of a unanimous-consent agreement. I would rather make another one to accommodate the Senator in some way tomorrow.

I want further to say to my good friend from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that I am glad he said what he did about the Senator from Michigan, and that his remark was not intended to be derogatory when he said the Senator from Michigan was ambitious. I do not think a Senator or anyone else who does not have some ambition is worth very much; and I regard the junior Senator from Michigan as one of the most valuable Members of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I referred to him as being ambitious when he said he would like to debate with me anywhere in the country. I said that he was ambitious. That is the way to get ahead. I admire his ambition.

Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senators for the opportunity to make the observations which have been made by me and other Senators. I think they have been most helpful. I respectfully and in all sincerity feel that as we make these appropriations we should make them in the light of a terrific budget which we are going to have to face this year, next year, and the next year, and do it with the idea of not only protecting our national defense, but, at the same time, keeping America solvent.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in order to secure agreement to the unanimous-consent request, I assured the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] that I would yield to him. I yield 5 minutes to him now, but I do not want it to be considered as a precedent with respect to succeeding amendments and that the committee will not claim the last argument. Hereafter I shall insist upon the right of the committee to close the debate.

CHARGES AGAINST JAMES P. FINNEGAN AND WILLIAM BOYLE, CHAIRMAN, DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on May 7, 1951, I invited the attention of the Senate to what I considered to be certain improper activities of James P. Finnegan, collector of internal revenue at St. Louis. Among the different irregularities to which I called attention there was an RFC loan by the American Lithofold Corp. amounting to $565,000; I pointed out how the loan had been rejected three times, going all the way to the Washington office. Then I pointed out how the decision was reversed and the loan was approved. In that speech I pointed out that within 14 days after the loan was made the records showed that Mr. Finnegan had been placed on the payroll of that corporation. I pointed out that 4 weeks later a stock certificate, No. 86, representing 120 shares of American Lithofold Corp. valued at $12,000, was transferred from the president of the company to Mrs. James P. Finnegan, the wife of the collector of internal revenue. The grand jury is now investigating those charges and other charges. At the same time I pointed out that the success of Mr. Finnegan in getting the loan could not have happened unless he had assistance in Washington.

I now want to read for the RECORD a comment which comes over the Associated Press wires this afternoon under the date line of of St. Louis:

The Post-Dispatch said today it had learned William M. Boyle, Jr., chairman of the Democratic National Committee, was paid $8,000 by a printing firm here after it received a $565,000 loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The newspaper, in a story by Theodore C. Link, said payments to Boyle from the American Lithofold Corp., began in 1949 soon after an RFC loan to it had been approved.

The Post-Dispatch also reported that the firm's transactions with former Collector of Internal Revenue James P. Finnegan are being investigated by a Federal grand jury here.

The newspaper reported that Boyle received payments of $500 a month, and that payments of $1,000 a month also were made to Finnegan, a close friend of Boyle's.

The Post-Dispatch said Boyle, in his office in Washington, told it he had received "some legal fees" from American Lithofold but added that his work "had nothing to do with RFC loans."

Finnegan resigned only recently as collector of internal revenue for the eastern half of Missouri. The grand jury began investigating his affairs after Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, charged that Finnegan used his office to promote personal business.

Mr. President, a couple of hours later this follow-up story came over the wires, and I wish to read this additional item:

Boyle was quoted by the Post-Dispatch as saying he could not recall how much in fees he had received from the company but that he had been retained for about 2½ months in 1949.

Boyle also was quoted as saying he had decided to quit law practice in May 1949 so there could be no intimation he was using "my position on the Democratic Committee in connection with any law cases * * *."

The newspaper said the loan to the St. Louis printing firm was made after Finnegan and R. J. Blauner, manager of the company, had attended a testimonial dinner for Boyle September 26, 1949, at Kansas City where Boyle long had been active in Democratic politics.

The Post-Dispatch reported that payments to Boyle and Finnegan stopped after Finnegan was advised in May 1950 by two agents of the Intelligence Unit of the Internal Revenue Bureau that his office was under investigation.

At the American Lithofold office today no officers of the company were available for comment. Finnegan could not be reached.

Mr. President, I think those two press dispatches speak for themselves, and demonstrate how low the morals of this administration have deteriorated during the past few years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Delaware has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Delaware three additional minutes if he desires to have that additional time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, Mr. President, I do not desire any additional time. The facts speak for themselves.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I relinquish the remainder of the time at my disposal. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has 5 minutes time remaining.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; I relinquish my time, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Moody
Anderson	Hoey	Morse
Benton	Holland	Mundt
Brewster	Hunt	Murray
Bricker	Ives	Neely
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Nixon
Butler, Md.	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Kem	Pastore
Chavez	Kerr	Robertson
Clements	Kilgore	Russell
Cordon	Knowland	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Langer	Smathers
Douglas	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Magnuson	Smith, N. C.
Ecton	Malone	Sparkman
Ellender	Martin	Stennis
Ferguson	Maybank	Taft
Frear	McCarran	Thye
Gillette	McCarthy	Underwood
Green	McClellan	Wherry
Hayden	McFarland	Wiley
Hendrickson	McKellar	Williams
Hennings	Millikin	Young
Hickenlooper	Monroney	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senators from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL and Mr. CARLSON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], for himself and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the committee amendment on page 33, line 1.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. For what purpose does the Senator rise?

Mr. KERR. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared, favoring the committee amendment and opposing the Dirksen amendment to the committee amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KERR

Under this agricultural conservation program the farmers of Oklahoma have continued to increase the amount of conservation practices that they have carried out from year to year. Since 1945 they have doubled the amount of agricultural limestone being spread on pastures and legumes in my home State. This means that we have more legumes in our pastures, our milk and beef yields are higher, and the quality of food that is produced has continued to rise. We still have many farms on which there is no improved pasture established.

Many farmers in some eastern Oklahoma counties had never used phosphate on their pastures until they were assisted through this agricultural conservation program. As a result, the amount of phosphate used has increased five times over 1945. A better quality of pasture is being seeded each year. Farmers are continuing to build terraces and dams to control the water that can quickly wash a farm away when conservation methods are not utilized; only this year some areas of Oklahoma have had 8 to 10 inches of rainfall within a 24-hour period. This only illustrates the need for a sound conservation program operated jointly by the farmer who owns the land and the Federal Government, which has an interest in the long-time maintenance of our natural resources.

It is my understanding that the people administering this program try to establish

their rates of assistance so that they put up about one-half of the costs of permanent practices. A smaller contribution is made on some practices that do not require a heavy cost investment on the part of the farmer. It should be noted that the cost of carrying out these practices has increased from 15 to 20 percent in the past 18 months. Farmers are willingly producing to meet the guides established by the Department of Agriculture today. They are doing it in spite of greenbugs, droughts in one area, and floods in another. Some of them are receiving good prices, but many of them are also faced with stiff competition to obtain farm labor and rising costs that soak up a good share of their profits. If we are going to maintain our soil resources, we must continue to share with the farmer the cost of completing conservation practices that he cannot be expected to carry out alone.

I am proud to point out that the Oklahoma State PMA Committee was one of the first in the Nation to initiate action under Secretary Brannan's memorandum No. 1278. This was a Department order calling for the local offices of PMA, SCS, and other Agriculture agencies to put their local offices together and coordinate their work more closely for the farmer. The Oklahoma PMA chairman initiated district meetings of all agencies to discuss these plans and take effective action immediately after the order was released in the Department. Many of our offices are now together in Oklahoma; many of them have plans to move. Detailed operations of the Department's conservation programs are being coordinated to obtain a more effective use of Federal personnel and funds. If we will continue this conservation program at a level close to the one set in recent years, I am confident that Oklahoma farmers will continue to meet all of their production goals and still improve the soil resources of the State. I urge that the amendment to reduce and cripple this great program be defeated.

Oklahoma

Practice	Unit	1945	1949	Percent 1949 is of 1945
Limestone	Tons	253,000	372,000	147
Phosphate, 20 percent P_2O_5 equivalent.	do	9,700	40,900	422
Winter legume cover and green manure.	Acres	42,000	253,000	602
Other green manure and cover.	do	330,000	420,000	127
Standard terraces	do	126,000	187,000	148
Dams for livestock and erosion control.	Number	11,700	8,700	74
Control of competitive plants on range land.	Acres	37,000	112,000	303
Improved seeding of pasture.	do	144,000	304,000	211

NOTE.—The above practices constitute 75 percent of the 1949 program. Minerals, vetch seedings, and pasture improvement have continued to increase in 1950 and 1951, although final figures are not available.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for himself and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the committee amendment on page 33, line 1.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask first that the amendment be stated, and then I shall ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 33, line 1, in the committee amendment it is proposed to strike out "$280,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$150,000,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this question the yeas and nays have been demanded.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senators from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL and Mr. CARLSON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is detained on official business.

On this vote the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

Also, I wish to announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—36

Brewster	Capehart	Ecton
Bricker	Cordon	Ferguson
Bridges	Dirksen	Frear
Butler, Md.	Douglas	Gillette
Byrd	Dworshak	Hendrickson
Hickenlooper	Martin	Robertson
Hunt	McCarthy	Saltonstall
Ives	Millikin	Smith, Maine
Kem	Moody	Smith, N. J.
Knowland	Nixon	Taft
Lodge	O'Conor	Thye
Malone	O'Mahoney	Williams

NAYS—41

Aiken	Johnson, Tex.	Mundt
Anderson	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Benton	Kerr	Neely
Chavez	Kilgore	Pastore
Clements	Langer	Russell
Eastland	Lehman	Smathers
Ellender	Magnuson	Smith, N. C.
Green	Maybank	Sparkman
Hayden	McCarran	Stennis
Hennings	McClellan	Underwood
Hill	McFarland	Wherry
Hoey	McKellar	Wiley
Holland	Monroney	Young
Johnson, Colo.	Morse	

NOT VOTING—19

Bennett	Flanders	McMahon
Butler, Nebr.	Fulbright	Schoeppel
Cain	George	Tobey
Carlson	Humphrey	Watkins
Case	Jenner	Welker
Connally	Kefauver	
Duff	Long	

So Mr. DIRKSEN's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment C.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 33, line 1, it is proposed to strike out "$280,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$200,000,000."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan realizes that the question involved in this amendment has been discussed and debated under the amendment which has just been voted on. The Senator from Michigan was in favor of that amendment. The figure had been recommended by the Farm Bureau Federation. We are dealing with next year, not this year. If the amendment had been approved we would have authorized $150,000,000. However, 41 Senators voted against the amendment and only 36 voted in favor of it. I am satisfied that the majority of Senators felt that the cut proposed would have been too deep.

When the Farm Bureau Federation recommended the figure of $150,000,000, it also recommended that the money be distributed on the basis of need. There is no other basis upon which distribution would be justified. The language in the bill itself, as approved by the committee, makes that point clear. It says:

> On the basis of a distribution of the funds available for payments and grants among the several States in accordance with their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary.

The reference is to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe it might be well for the Senator from Michigan to read the remainder of the sentence.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will.

Mr. RUSSELL. Because it nullifies the other provision.

Mr. FERGUSON. It reads:

> Except that the proportion allocated to any State shall not be reduced more than 15 per-

cent from the distribution for the next preceding program year.

Mr. RUSSELL. That sentence absolutely nullifies the basis of need provision. It would not be on the basis of need unless the proviso beginning in line 5, after the word "Secretary", down to and including the comma following the word "year" in line 7, is stricken from the bill. Otherwise there would be no distribution on the basis of need. The proviso would prevent such distribution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was going to say that certainly I would keep faith with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. When I made my argument in behalf of reducing the amount by $130,000,000 I said that if the amendment were adopted I would offer an amendment to strike out the language referred to by the Senator from Georgia, so that the distribution would be made on the basis of need. If the pending amendment is adopted I shall offer such an amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The senior Senator from Illinois made the same pledge. I assume the Senator from Michigan feels the same way.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the pending amendment is agreed to we shall move to strike out the proviso. Even if Michigan and Illinois do not gain anything by it, we are perfectly willing and ready to have the South get all the money it needs.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. That is what the Farm Bureau Federation was talking about. Mr. Kline felt that need should be the basis of the allotment of this amount of money.

The Senator from Michigan feels that in these trying times, when there is need for economy and when it is necessary to save dollars for the real military defense of America, we ought to be applying the appropriation for the conservation of soil on the basis of need.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG. I am at a loss to know which basis of need is referred to. If the Senator from Michigan is referring to the basis of need plan which the Department of Agriculture has been applying, Indiana and Illinois would gain. The States which would lose most would be Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Kansas, and other States. I shall give the Senator the exact figures. I intend to read them into the RECORD later.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from South Dakota does not mean to infer that the State of Michigan would get more?

Mr. YOUNG. Illinois and Indiana would get more.

Mr. FERGUSON. But not the State of Michigan.

Mr. YOUNG. Michigan would lose the difference between $6,534,000 and $5,505,000. That is on the basis of $300,000,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. THYE. I cannot concur in the idea that the PMA soil-conservation program should be applied on the basis of needy States.

I have just supported a reduction in the PMA appropriations. It was contrary to my convictions. However, I recognize the great need for economy. I felt that I could not vote "nay" on that economy move, although I thought the cut was far too drastic.

With $150,000,000 spread over the States we could keep the program intact for another year. I definitely feel that if we start changing the policy allocating the funds, and we completely dry up the program in one State and expand the program in another State, we will destroy the entire organization in a State in which the program is not carried on. If we destroy the organization in a State we will destroy any program of soil building and fertility building which may now be carried on in the State.

Mr. President, I am sorry that I am taking the time of the Senator from Michigan. I was not aware of the fact that we were operating under a limitation of time.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan, in making the proposal for the cut, realizes that he is touching on the one sore spot in the whole program, or in any program, in the Congress. It is: "How much does my State get?" There is real reason for economy, even though the proposal in effect means that the State of Michigan would lose. The amendment would cut the appropriation from $285,000,000, as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, from $225,000,000, as passed by the House, to $200,000,000, which would leave $50,000,000 more than the amendment of the Senator from Illinois would have left in the bill. We are missing the point of economy, while we are in this great need for funds for armaments, if we cannot look at the over-all picture of America with respect to what is exactly needed by necessity.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to have the Senator from Michigan tell the Senate how much our Government is spending for soil conservation in foreign countries. In view of that situation, how can any Senator say that our country will be helped by the adoption of this amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, what the Senator from North Dakota has referred to seems to keep us from making cuts in the budget. Every time we wish to make a cut, that point is raised. Naturally I want the Senator from North Dakota to feel as he does about the appropriations intended for the benefit of other countries, and I have the same sort of feeling. However, at this time we should be discussing the pending appropriation bill. Thereafter, when the appropriations for foreign aid come before the Senate, we should vote on those appropriations and we should reduce their amount.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. FERGUSON. In a moment.

Mr. President, when we had before us the question of giving millions of dollars to India, 32 Members of the Senate voted not to make a loan to India in that case, but to insist on giving the money to India. That vote will be cited time after time on the floor of the Senate, and therefore it will be said that we must not make cuts in the programs for the United States and must not reduce any of our domestic programs by even as much as one employee, because we are appropriating money for the benefit of every foreign nation that is outside the iron curtain.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I am not talking about India. I am talking about reclamation and soil conservation in foreign countries. I do not propose, if I can help it, to reduce the appropriations for these programs for the farmers of North Dakota, and then give the money to farmers in foreign countries.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from North Dakota is talking about the point 4 program.

Mr. LANGER. No; I am not talking about the point 4 program.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator refers to reclamation or to ECA. No matter by what title the program is known, it is still the same.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Have not we provided $7,000,000,000 for the construction of new industrial plants in the United States?

Mr. FERGUSON. If the Senator from Vermont chooses to refer to that as a gift, at least I do not think an analysis of it will indicate that it is a gift. It is simply the deferment of the payment of taxes upon such plants for a 5-year period; and that deferment can be stopped tomorrow by having the executive branch of the Government refuse to allow or refuse to approve that tax amortization program.

Mr. AIKEN. But the Senator from Michigan has no idea that it will be stopped, of course.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does the Senator from Michigan think he is helping the United States when he is jeopardizing the national economy by not protecting its resources? What kind of economy is that, Mr. President?

The other day the Senator was with some of the rest of us in Kansas City.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As the Senator knows, the Congress economized on flood control and thus saved some money. However, the disaster the Senator from Michigan saw in Kansas City and the pathetic human suffering there proved that the cuts which were made in the appropriations were not good economy. The loss

of $175,000,000 in order to save a few dollars was not good economy.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, no Member of the Senate realizes more than I do that great loss and great calamity in the West today. It cannot be appreciated until it is actually seen.

However, Mr. President, I am not arguing against saving the soil of the United States. My point is that today, in view of the necessity for armament and for expenditures in that field, in order to try to stop aggression in the world and to defeat the enemy, we must make cuts in the other programs, and we must make cuts in the appropriations carried in this bill. By making the cut which I propose, we shall not harm this program, because the Farm Bureau Federation says that for a year or two the program can be placed on the basis of necessity or need and can be carried on for $150,000,000.

I am trying to persuade the Senate today not to cut the amount to $150,000,000, but to cut it to $200,000,000. I hope we shall vote to make that cut.

When other matters come before us—for instance, flood control on the Mississippi or the Missouri or the Kansas Rivers or the other rivers, let us do our duty in those matters, as the Senate can do its duty.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish the Senator from Michigan would answer this question: What good will it do to provide billions and billions of dollars for armaments if we lose the soil of our country?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, that argument would apply equally to appropriating for this item $285,000,000 or $300,000,000 or $400,000,000. However, that is not the way the farmers regard this matter.

Some good arguments have been made on the floor of the Senate today. Senators talk about education in connection with this program. Mr. President, how long must we educate people with American dollars. I think the American farmer is smarter than to have to be educated every year. The time will come when he will graduate from the course; and I believe the average American farmer knows how to run his farm a great deal better than some persons in Washington believe he does. The farmer himself is only asking, through his farm organization, that $150,000,000 be appropriated for this program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Senator after Senator rose on the floor this afternoon and began his remarks with the assumption that if we reduce the appropriation for this program by a few million dollars, the soil-conservation program will end. If that is so, it is a confession that the soil-conservation program has failed from the beginning.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not one who thinks the farmer will stop his soil-conservation work merely because he is paid $17.50 instead of $35.

Mr. FERGUSON. If that reduction is made, the farmer will simply devote his efforts and his resources to the most essential part of his soil-conservation work.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly.

Mr. FERGUSON. If we vote for the $7,500,000,000 tax increase, the farmer will spend for soil conservation more than he will receive by means of soil-conservation payments or checks. He will also spend on soil conservation some of the proceeds of the sale of the produce from his farm.

Mr. President, I have prepared a few remarks on this matter, and I now ask unanimous consent that they may be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. I make that request in order to save time, so that we may proceed to vote promptly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FERGUSON

Page 33, line 1: Strike out "$280,000,000" and insert "$200,000,000."

This amendment deals with the subject, "Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources," the program of payment to farmers to build terraces, use fertilizers, rotate crops, and so forth. This is not a liquidation of commitments. This item deals with the 1952 program; in other words, it is the authorization to enter into agreements with farmers as to what work they will be paid for next year.

If any measurable reduction is to be made in this program, it must be done in this item, now. Next year's appropriation will be measured by the authorization we establish in this bill.

Pertinent data respecting this item is as follows:

(a) The budget estimate is $285,000,000.

(b) The House provided $225,000,000.

(c) The Senate committee recommends $280,000,000.

(d) Allan Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation recommended $150,000,000.

All of us are in agreement that our soil is a precious resource; that our existence, present and future, depends upon it like no other. The question does not revolve about that point, but whether this program is the essential element in the conservation of that soil. When this program was initiated, two major considerations could be used as justification for these payments to the farmer:

(a) The need to render financial aid for land improvement at a time when the farmers' financial resources were low;

(b) The need to educate the farmer in the importance of conservation.

Neither of these needs are present today. The financial position of the farmer is reasonably sound, and as the proponents of this program proclaim, the conservation practices pay for themselves in a few years. The need for education likewise should diminish—even children are graduated from school. The distinction is one of institutionalized education. Education never ceases, but as a society we assume that after we have given an individual a basic education he will further it from day to day of his own accord. The Department of Agriculture is replete with agencies to make new knowledge available to the farmer, and an entirely separate organization is unnecessary to advise on fertilizer use, cover crops, etc.

Basically, we are in opposition to the assumption that the farmer is too uninformed or too uncaring to protect the foundation of his own livelihood—the care of his own soil—unless he is paid. You may pay your child to brush his teeth, to teach him a practice of dental hygiene, but you assume it to be his own responsibility after he becomes an adult. I admire the farmer and I am for him. I just do not think he must be bribed to be a good citizen motivated by enlightened self-interest.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, does the Senator from North Dakota wish to speak now?

Mr. YOUNG. I shall need only 3 or 4 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. President, if this amendment to the committee amendment is adopted, thus reducing this appropriation item from $280,000,000 to $200,000,000, and if, in addition, we make another change by way of another amendment to the committee amendment—and I now refer to the so-called basis-of-need amendment which has been proposed, and striking out the 15-percent provision—a great deal of injury will be done; in fact, we would then add insult to injury.

Under the 15-percent provision, if we adopt the basis-of-need proposal, no State can lose more than 15 percent of its total payments. Keeping the 15-percent provision would be most important to prevent undue discrimination between the States. If we adopt the basis-of-need proposal and strike out the 15-percent amendment, some States will be hurt badly, and some of them will be States which we would least expect or want to hurt.

On the basis of need, as I stated before, the Midwest—including the States of Illinois and Indiana—would actually gain considerably.

Kansas would lose quite heavily.

Among the States which would lose most would be Maryland and Michigan. Minnesota would lose about $2,000,000. That would be on the basis of a $300,000,000 program, as the details have been worked out by the Department of Agriculture.

California would be another State which would lose quite heavily.

So, all in all, the basis-of-need plan is certainly far from perfect.

I myself would favor a real basis-of-need program if we had time to work it out. However, if it were applied as it has been in the past, under the present program of the Department of Agriculture, it certainly would do injustice to many States.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. That amendment would follow the pending amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. And Senators could vote for the $200,000,000, as proposed by my amendment to the pending committee amendment; or, as Mr. Kline, of the American Farm Bureau Federation says, Senators could vote for an amendment to place the program on the basis of need.

Mr. YOUNG. Yes. I myself believe a small cut would be in order. But in my opinion $200,000,000 is certainly too small an amount.

Mr. YOUNG subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as part of the remarks which I made a few moments ago, a table entitled "Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources," prepared by the Department of Agriculture. It indicates the amount which each State would receive under the soil-conservation program, on the basis of need and under the old formula. The table is based on a program of $300,000,000 a year.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Conservation and use of agricultural land resources—distribution of funds on basis of a $300,000,000 appropriation, under 1947 formula and the formula prescribed by Congress for the 1948 program

[In thousands of dollars]

State and region	Based on 1948 without minimum	Basis of 1947 formula [1]	Basis of 1948 formula with minimum
Maine	1,006	1,079	964
New Hampshire	445	452	415
Vermont	1,620	937	1,349
Massachusetts	640	809	633
Rhode Island	111	93	100
Connecticut	524	525	503
New York	7,22[illegible]	5,685	6,559
New Jersey	1,131	1,052	1,073
Pennsylvania	7,848	5,160	6,721
North Atlantic		15,792	18,338
Ohio	6,608	7,999	6,582
Indiana	6,388	6,535	6,103
Illinois	10,704	10,000	10,034
Michigan	5,509	6,534	5,505
Wisconsin	7,753	7,413	7,329
Minnesota	3,963	8,277	7,041
Iowa	9,181	10,409	9,059
Missouri	9,113	10,097	8,896
North Dakota	3,254	7,210	5,975
South Dakota	4,082	6,866	6,225
Nebraska	5,208	8,482	7,231
Kansas	10,235	9,716	9,575
North Central		99,538	89,565
Delaware	146	483	438
Maryland	1,513	1,888	1,711
Virginia	5,676	4,839	5,176
West Virginia	2,132	2,422	2,114
North Carolina	8,513	6,937	7,653
South Carolina	4,754	4,132	4,292
Georgia	9,176	6,658	7,920
Florida	2,853	2,700	2,721
South Atlantic		30,059	32,025
Kentucky	6,770	8,056	6,976
Tennessee	8,036	6,875	7,350
Alabama	9,932	6,161	8,349
Mississippi	8,903	6,986	7,915
Arkansas	6,434	5,850	5,936
Louisiana	6,406	4,046	5,412
Oklahoma	10,699	8,064	9,373
Texas	29,361	21,394	25,797
South Central		67,432	77,108
Montana	2,468	5,204	4,464
Idaho	2,195	2,287	2,114
Wyoming	1,456	2,127	1,928
Colorado	3,834	4,246	3,757
New Mexico	1,474	2,834	2,345
Arizona	1,140	1,856	1,511
Utah	1,143	1,320	1,126
Nevada	229	331	276
Washington	2,600	3,553	2,974
Oregon	1,870	3,130	2,619
California	3,868	6,794	6,161
Western		33,682	29,275
Alaska	25	43	37
Hawaii	100	213	183

Footnotes at end of table.

Conservation and use of agricultural land resources—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

State and region	Based on 1948 without minimum	Basis of 1947 formula [1]	Basis of 1948 formula with minimum
Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands	1,657	1,241	1,469
Total all States	248,000	[2] 248,000	[2] 248,000
Reserve for administrative expenses, small payment increases and allotments to cooperating agencies	52,000	52,000	52,000
Grand total	300,000	300,000	300,000

[1] Approximation based on pro rata adjustments. If complete detail is worked out slight variations may result.

[2] For practice.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement in regard to the pending amendment to the committee amendment.

The statement has been made again and again that the proposed reduction in this appropriation is supported by the American Farm Bureau Federation. Mr. President, the American Farm Bureau Federation is not charged with all the responsibility in connection with this matter. The Members of the Senate of the United States have a very specific responsibility.

I wish that the voice of the average member of the American Farm Bureau Federation might be heard in these Halls before this vote is taken. Mr. President, I would be perfectly willing to submit this matter to the rank and file of the farmers of the Nation, the men who till the soil with their hands, not the professional farmers, but the men who actually produce the food we eat and the clothes we wear. If 75 percent of them did not vote for the full budget estimate in this case, I would agree to the elimination of the entire program.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Would not the Senator also be perfectly willing to see this matter submitted to the rank and file of the members of the American Farm Bureau Federation?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is what I said. I said I would be perfectly willing to submit it to the rank and file of the members of the American Farm Bureau Federation itself; and if 75 percent of them did not vote for the full amount of the budget estimate, not simply for the reduced amount, I would be perfectly willing to see the program go down altogether.

Leave it to the rank and file, and see what they say about it; because, Mr. President, they have seen this program develop the fertility of the soil, they have seen this program enable them to enjoy just a few of the things which the average citizen of this country takes as being as natural as the air that he breathes and the water that he drinks, to enable him in some circumstances to paint his little farm house, to put screens in the windows, perhaps to be able to have a pump for the purpose of pumping water to his home. It has caused the farm life of this country to improve immeasurably.

Not only has it help the farmer—and for that reason he would support it—but it has helped the United States. I have made references here—and I have brought charts which have demonstrated it—to the tremendously increased production of farm products, which we secured in World War II from the same lands, with less equipment and with less labor. We would never have reached those production goals had it not been for the fact that we had a program of conservation for several years, which had restored in some measure the fertility of our soils.

Mr. DIRKSEN rose.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will yield briefly, but I have only a few moments. I yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am grateful to the Senator, and I merely wanted to reaffirm what I said today. In December 1950, in Dallas, Tex., the Farm Bureau said they were for deep economy and retrenchment. Secondly, in January of this year, they voted in favor of this $150,000,000 cut, and they reaffirmed that vote in July of this year. There was ample time to inform all the farmers at the grassroots level, and if they were not satisfied with it, Western Union and the mailman would not be able to carry all the communications that would now be in this Chamber and on the desks of the Members.

Mr. RUSSELL. Who made and cast these votes? I understand it was the directors of the Farm Bureau Federation. They are the ones who cast the vote to emasculate the conservation program. They did not submit it to the members who went to the national convention I understand. This $150,000,000 cut was recommended by 17 or 18 directors of a farm organization; and I stand upon the conviction and never was more sincere, that, if it were left to the rank and file farmers, they would repudiate the action of those men overwhelmingly.

This is not a new issue; we have had it before. We once cut this appropriation drastically before, and the farmers did not vote against the directors of the farm organizations. When the Congress of the United States sought to escape its responsibility and used the Farm Bureau as a reason to cripple this activity, the farmers voted out most of the people who had voted for the cut—not the Farm Bureau people but those who were serving here in Washington and who blindly followed the word from the headquarters of the Farm Bureau.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Farm Bureau, at its convention, adopted a proposal for economy in government. Is it the interpretation of the Senator from Georgia that that meant the false economy which goes along with the wasting of the top soil of America?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not, of course; because it is penny-wise and pound-foolish, when we have as vital a stake as the very means of existence of the people, to come here and have a piddling reduction in this already inadequate amount. Go out and tell the farmers what we have done. Go out and say, "Yes, I followed the injunction of the Farm Bureau, and I killed the farm conservation program, to all intents and purposes. We were having a great national defense drive, and we had to cut your appropriation of a little pittance for soil conservation, because of the defense drive. Of course, we are calling on you for greatly increased production." In the name of patriotism the farmers of this Nation have been requested to produce next year more food and clothing than they were called upon to produce in any year during World War II. But you propose to tell the farmer, "Yes, we cut the soil conservation appropriation to the bone. Of course, when we wished to secure increased production from industries, we gave $7,000,000,000 of tax exemption or amortization benefits to industry in order that it might increase its production and to make up this benefit to the poor corporations; we had to cut your soil conservation activities." We have granted $7,000,000,000 in tax benefits to industry so that industry could produce, when it is well known that industrial production will amount to nothing if we do not have food for the soldiers, and for the people, and if we do not have clothing for the armies.

When you vote for this amendment you say to the American farmer: "We were compelled to all but wreck the farm program. The Farm Bureau said it would be all right to do so. We had to cut the pittance going to preserve the fertility of our soil in order to make up the tax benefits granted to the giant industrial corporations of this Nation to get them to produce. We are compelled to cut this item in order that we might continue subsidies to the carriers of mail by air and sea. The program required us to build ships. We had to cut this appropriation in order that we might provide the hundreds of millions of dollars of subsidies to ship builders and to ship operators to build ships for the defense program."

I do not propose to take the position that the American farmer is to be required to assume greater burdens in soil conservation practices and simultaneously increase his production at a time when production allowances are being made to all others who are called upon to produce for the defense program. The farmer is patriotic but I do not believe that this would make him happy.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Possibly we were subsidizing the merchant marine, to the extent of several hundred million dollars, so that, 20 years from now, we will be better able to bring food and fiber from foreign countries.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is exactly what will happen if we relax conservation efforts and I thank the Senator from Vermont for that very sage contribution. Here we are dealing with the life of this country, not just today. This program can be stricken down, and, for the next 2 or 3 years, perhaps it would make little difference; but we should legislate here with an eye to the future generations which are to come. It is impossible to support a population which is increasing at the rate of 6,000 people a day in this country, and continue to lose a half million acres of tillable land a year; it just does not make sense.

The acreage of tillable land per person in this country becomes smaller each and every year. How do you propose to support this increasing population on a smaller per capita acreage if you destroy the only program which lends aid to maintain the fertility of our limited acreage? I shall not be placed in the position of approving $7,000,000,000 of tax benefits in order to assist the large industrial corporations build new factories in the city of Detroit and in other great industrial centers, and then come here in the name of economy and cut down a program which is vital to the life and existence of future generations of American citizens.

Mr. President, I repeat that such a program does not make sense to me. Increased agricultural production is as esential as more production in any other line. I cannot understand a proposal to reduce the national income by billions of dollars in forgiven tax benefits and paying hundreds of millions of dollars in subsidies to people who can make their voices heard in the Congress, and at the same time to strike down this vital farm-conservation program. The farmer who actually tills the soil is too busy trying to produce food for us to eat and clothing material for us to wear to come here and present his case or to flood this Capitol with telegrams. This is a conservation item. For many years this bill carried $500,000,000 each year, and it was considered a conservation, not a subsidy, program by all who promoted it, from President Franklin D. Roosevelt on down.

Then the war came, and we listened to economizers and cut the amount approximately $300,000,000. Now, when we are calling upon the farmers to produce more than they have ever been asked to produce before, when the increase in population puts upon them the requirement that they continue to increase their production per acre each year, we are asked to cut $80,000,000 out of the only program that protects the most priceless inheritance we have. We are all proud of industrial development, but, after all, the original source of all wealth is the soil.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. This economy is asked at a time when the Government is calling upon the farmers for the greatest possible production when we need soil conservation most.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question about that.

Mr. MUNDT. During World War I the farmers plowed areas which had never before been plowed, and then came the dust storms, and the Government spent billions of dollars to try to restore the former condition of the land.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. President, I favor economy, but not the false economy inherent in this amendment. When we consider the requirements on the people of the United States who produce in this great emergency, we should at least exercise a reasonable degree of fairness. Farmers are not accustomed to preferential treatment, but when they are being asked to increase production by 48 percent over the 1940 average, they should be entitled to some consideration. No one has asked for a tax exemption for them. They will be taxed for a long time to come to make up for the $7,000,000,000 allowed industry in this Nation. The merchant marine subsidy is a straight subsidy, but ships will wear out.

I look upon the conservation program as an insurance policy. An ordinarily prudent man would take out an insurance policy for his loved ones. Some of us think this is an insurance policy for the future of the United States, to protect the fertility of the soil.

Under it we are planting hundreds of millions of trees; we have built thousands of miles of terracing, and thousands of miles of firebreaks to protect our forests. We reach every phase of the conservation of the most priceless asset that any people can have—the land, from whence comes that which is necessary for our existence. We can deplete it, as the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] stated in connection with our treatment of the soil in World War I. But are we dealing fairly with the generations that are to come? We are leaving them a staggering public debt which is the result, largely, of our own errors. They will have to contend with this debt for many generations. This amendment does much more than to economize and cut down on the farmer today.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. With reference to only one item in this bill, namely, forests, 90,000,000 acres of forest lands belong to the American people. Is it economical not to provide for keeping those acres from fire, so that at least those who come after us will at least see a tree?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have always favored adequate protection of the forests, but if we do not do something to maintain the fertility of the soil there will come a time when there will not be anyone here to see the trees if we save them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All time for debate has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Mr. WHERRY and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CON-

NALLY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senators from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL and Mr. CARLSON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness.

On this vote the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea" and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

Also, I wish to announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—37

Brewster	Dirksen	Hendrickson
Bricker	Douglas	Hickenlooper
Bridges	Dworshak	Hunt
Butler, Md.	Ecton	Ives
Byrd	Ferguson	Kem
Capehart	Frear	Knowland
Cordon	Gillette	Lodge
Malone	O'Conor	Taft
Martin	O'Mahoney	Thye
McCarthy	Robertson	Wherry
Millikin	Saltonstall	Williams
Moody	Smith, Maine	
Nixon	Smith, N. J.	

NAYS—38

Aiken	Johnson, Colo.	Monroney
Anderson	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Benton	Johnston, S. C.	Mundt
Chavez	Kerr	Murray
Clements	Kilgore	Pastore
Eastland	Langer	Russell
Ellender	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Green	Magnuson	Sparkman
Hayden	Maybank	Stennis
Hennings	McCarran	Underwood
Hill	McClellan	Wiley
Hoey	McFarland	Young
Holland	McKellar	

NOT VOTING—21

Bennett	Flanders	McMahon
Butler, Nebr.	Fulbright	Neely
Cain	George	Schoeppel
Carlson	Humphrey	Smathers
Case	Jenner	Tobey
Connally	Kefauver	Watkins
Duff	Long	Welker

So Mr. FERGUSON's amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on the committee amendment on page 33, line 1.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the committee amendment. If the amendment is not agreed to, it will reduce the amount to $225,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. The committee amendment would increase the amount to $280,000,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. If the amendment is defeated, the amount will be $225,000,000. On that amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the suggestion?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. May we not vote on that amendment tomorrow? I ask that question of the distinguished majority leader in view of the fact that a quorum call will probably result in bringing back to the Senate Chamber some Senators who may have left thinking that a further vote would not be taken tonight.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I told two or three Senators that we were not going to have any further vote today. So in fairness to them, the action of the amendment will have to go over until tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona move a recess?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, just a moment. What was the statement made by the majority leader?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I told two or three Senators that no further vote would be had today.

Mr. WHERRY. I also made the same statement to several Senators.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I would be willing to vote on the amendment this afternoon, but, of course, if the Senator from Arizona has made a commitment of the nature he just stated, then we should not act on the amendment tonight.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I would very much appreciate it if the distinguished Senator from Georgia would permit action on the amendment to go over until tomorrow. I urge no reason for suggesting that it go over except that two or three Members of the Senate have left on my assurance that there would be no more votes this evening.

Mr. RUSSELL. It was my understanding that we would continue in session considerably later than this hour, but if the Senator from Nebraska has assured Senators on his side that no more votes would be taken this evening, of course, we should abide by that assurance.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have given such assurance, and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] has done the same.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Notwithstanding the fact that the yeas and nays have been ordered, is an amendment to the committee amendment still in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Vice President.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed——

Mr. MORSE. Just a moment. I should like to address an inquiry to the majority leader.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. MORSE. I understood that when the Senate had finished action on the amendment to the committee amendment on page 33, line 1, the majority leader was going to try and arrange, at the end of the day, some time for those who wished to make brief remarks on subjects not related to the pending business.

Mr. MCFARLAND. That is what I shall undertake to do, but I thought we would dispose of the nominations on the Executive Calendar first, if the Senator from Oregon does not mind.

Mr. MORSE. Very well.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MCFARLAND. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Alton Adolor Lessard to be United States attorney for the district of Maine.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frank B. Potter to be United States attorney for the northern district of Texas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Richard C. O'Connell to be United States marshal for the district of Maryland.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and without objection, the President will be notified immediately of these confirmations.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I express gratification that the Senate has acted favorably upon the nomination of Richard C. O'Connell to be United States marshal for the district of Maryland. The Committee on the Judiciary held a hearing on the nomination and unanimously approved it. Our inquiries among judges, members of the bar and citizens generally attest to Mr. O'Connell's experience, to his efficiency, and to his dependability. I am confident that the country has secured the services of a very valuable man.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business, and that the limitation of debate be not effective for the remainder of the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE PENDING RAILROAD DISPUTE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a few remarks on two subjects for the RECORD. First, I desire to call the attention of the Senate again to the fact that there is still a pending railroad dispute in America which has lasted now for some 2 years. I hold in my hand a letter which was addressed on July 24 to the representatives of the carriers and to the representatives of three brotherhoods, namely, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, and the Order of Railway Conductors of America. The letter is addressed to these organizations by the National Mediation Board. I read a portion of it:

GENTLEMEN: On or about January 19, 1951, at a meeting held at the White House, the suggestion was made that the National Mediation Board undertake further efforts to resolve the current controversies between the above-named parties. Since that time the National Mediation Board has endeavored to assist the parties in arriving at a final and complete settlement and/or disposition of all the matters involved in the dispute. These efforts have proved unavailing, and we believe it will be conceded that the negotiations are now deadlocked.

In view of the history of these negotiations and pending our further action you are advised that the National Mediation Board is forwarding a report to the President of the United States outlining the present status of these cases, and likewise advising the Secretary of the Army.

The Board does not presently plan to schedule any further conferences, but in the event any of the parties should feel that the Board can assist them in any manner, it stands ready to consult with them.

Very truly yours,

LEVERETT EDWARDS,
Chairman.

I hold in my hand a copy of a letter dated January 24, addressed to Mr. Edwards by Mr. D. B. Robertson, president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen; Mr. J. P. Shields, grand chief engineer of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; and Mr. R. O. Hughes, president of the Order of Railway Conductors. The letter reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 24, 1951.*

Mr. LEVERETT EDWARDS,
Chairman, National Mediation Board,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 24 addressed to Messrs. Horning, Loomis, Baker, and the undersigned.

Your communication recites that the mediatory efforts of the National Mediation Board to resolve the current controversies between the parties have proved unavailing and that the negotiations are now deadlocked.

The Railway Labor Act prescribes, in the event the Board's efforts to bring about an amicable settlement through mediation are unsuccessful, that the Board shall at once endeavor as its final required action to induce the parties to submit the controversy to arbitration. In lieu of the commanded prompt exercise of its statutory obligation and authority to proffer arbitration, the Board has decided to report the status of the cases to the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Army, without scheduling future conferences, and with the further delays and uncertainties that such procedure entails.

With the purpose of promoting prompt and orderly settlement of the controversy, you are hereby advised that we are willing to arbitrate it under the Railway Labor Act, provided a satisfactory agreement to arbitrate can be reached with the carriers, and provided further that the agreement to arbitrate is made contingent upon the parties agreeing upon the neutral arbitrator or arbitrators, or a mutually satisfactory arrangement for selecting him or them.

Yours very truly,

D. B. ROBERTSON,
President, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

J. P. SHIELDS,
Grand Chief Engineer, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

R. O. HUGHES,
President, Order of Railway Conductors.

I also hold in my hand a letter which I received under date of July 25 from Mr. D. B. Robertson, Mr. J. P. Shields, and Mr. R. O. Hughes. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter which I received, and which I have just identified, printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 25, 1951.*

The Honorable WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senator, Oregon,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Appreciating the very deep interest you have shown in the long-pending dispute between the carriers and their employees represented by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, and Order of Railway Conductors, the attached copies of communications exchanged between the National Mediation Board and the undersigned contain a further development of interest.

At the conclusion of a conference which we had with Dr. Steelman and members of the National Mediation Board in Dr. Steelman's office about the middle of January, he turned the case back to the National Mediation Board, since which time that tribunal has exercised continuous jurisdiction and has held separate and joint conferences with the parties.

At the conclusion of the last joint conference between the parties and the Mediation Board, on July 19, all concerned agreed that the situation had reached a hopeless deadlock, and in closing the conference the chairman of the Mediation Board requested the parties to stand by awaiting a communication from the Board advising them with respect to further procedure. The attached communication dated July 24 followed.

The action taken by the Board in referring the case to the President seemed to us quite premature and out of line with the mandatory procedures of the Railway Labor Act, with particular reference to that part of section 5 reading:

"The Mediation Board may proffer its services in case any labor emergency is found by it to exist at any time. In either event the said Board shall promptly put itself in communication with the parties to such controversy, and shall use its best efforts, by mediation, to bring them to agreement. If such efforts to bring about an amicable settlement through mediation shall be unsuccessful, the said Board shall at once endeavor as its final required action (except as provided in paragraph third of this section and in section 10 of this act) to induce the parties to submit their controversy to arbitration, in accordance with the provisions of this act."

While it is true that section 10 of the Railway Labor Act provides that if a dispute between a carrier and its employees is not adjusted and should, in the judgment of the Mediation Board, threaten substantially to interrupt interstate commerce to a degree such as to deprive any section of the country of essential transportation service, the Mediation Board shall notify the President, who may thereupon, in his discretion, create a board to investigate and report respecting such dispute, the finding of facts and reports of such boards to the President are not binding upon the parties and usually lead to long delays and uncertainties and seldom ever result in their acceptance by the parties as a basis for disposing of the matters in controversy.

One of the organizations—the Order of Railway Conductors—involved in the present case had already had this deplorable experience. It was to avoid a repetition of this experience and its imposition upon the three organizations now involved that we decided to not only remind the National Mediation Board that it had prematurely and without fulfilling its own mandatory duties under the law referred the case to the President of the United States, but to propose the only procedure available to the parties that would bring the dispute to a final and definite conclusion, namely, arbitration; hence our letter to the chairman of the National Mediation Board, dated July 24.

At your convenience we would appreciate an opportunity to talk with you further about this matter.

Yours very truly,

D. B. ROBERTSON,
President, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

J. P. SHIELDS,
Grand Chief Engineer, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

N. O. HUGHES,
President, Order of Railway Conductors.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for a great many months past, as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate, and as one who took a very active part in the recent hearings which we conducted on the

DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued July 27, 1951
For actions of July 26, 1951
82nd-1st, No. 137

CONTENTS

HIGHLIGHTS. Senate debated agricultural appropriation bill. House passed State, Justice, Commerce appropriation bill. House committee ordered baler-twine-import bill reported. House committee tabled St. Lawrence Seaway bill. Rep. Whitten suggested provision to provide for quarterly reductions in personnel.

SENATE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952. Continued debate on this bill, H. R. 3973 (pp. 9158-91). All remaining committee amendments were agreed to except as otherwise indicated below. The committee amendment to increase the advance ACP authorization to $280,000,000 was agreed to by a 41-39 vote (pp. 9158-92). Before the Senate agreed to the committee amendment increasing plant, soil, and engineering research and providing for a new laboratory at Orlando, Fla., Sen. Wherry and others requested that the Department use $40,000 for wheat mosaic whether the increase is agreed to in conference or not (pp. 9168-70).

Agreed to the following amendments also:

By Sen. Douglas, to reduce agricultural production programs by $2,000,000, by a 48-30 vote (pp. 9170-2).

By Sen. Russell, to appropriate $76,808,000 to discharge indebtedness of CCC to the Treasury for the net costs under the International Wheat Agreement during the fiscal year 1950. The Senator's amendment to direct the Treasury to cancel CCC notes in this amount was ruled out of order. (pp. 9186-91.)

By Sen. Ken, for himself and others, to strike out the proviso, under meat inspection, "That hereafter reimbursement may be made by any person, firm, or organization for the expenses of meat inspection in excess of those which can be met from the amount appropriated for such purpose of each year" (pp. 9181-2).

Rejected the following amendments:

By Sen. Douglas, to reduce the 1952 ACP appropriation by $20,750,000, by a 24-52 vote (pp. 9162-5).

By Sen. Ferguson, to reduce the 1952 ACP appropriation by $5,000,000, by a 13-24 division vote (pp. 9165-7).

By Sen. Dirksen, to reduce crop-insurance administrative expenses from $7,949,911 to $4,904,500, by a 33-44 vote (pp. 9172-6).

By Sen. Douglas, to reduce FHA production-subsistence loans from

$110,000,000 to $103,000,000, (pp. 9176-7).

By Sen. Nixon, decreasing Office of Information by $337,000 and prohibiting use of these appropriations for the Agricultural Year Book, by a 35-37 vote (pp. 9177-80).

By Sen. Douglas, decreasing CCC administrative expenses by $1,000,000 (pp. 9180-1).

An Anderson amendment, appropriating $4,000,000 for construction of access roads to uranium deposits, was ruled out of order (pp. 9182-6).

2. REORGANIZATION; BUILDINGS. The Expenditures in the Executive Departments Committee agreed to hold hearings on S. 1149, regarding USDA reorganization, at a date to be announced later; and voted to defer action on S. 1621, to authorize lease-purchase agreements, and S. 1623, to provide for decentralization of Government employees, until it is determined whether further hearings are necessary (p. D680).

3. WEED CONTROL. In reporting S. 1041 (see Digest 136), the committee amended it so as to restrict its application to Halogeton, instead of applying it to all poisonous weeds, and to provide separate authorization to the Interior Department to operate a program on land under its jurisdiction, instead of giving the Agriculture Department authority over the entire program.

4. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. The conferees on S. 1717, to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, reached agreement on rent-control and housing provisions in the bill (p. D683).

5. FURS. The conferees on H. R. 2321, to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs, agreed to file a conference report (p. D683).

HOUSE

6. STATE-JUSTICE-COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952. Passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 4740 (pp. 9114-50). The following are among the actions taken before final passage:

Agreed, 155-137, to an amendment by Rep. Williams, Miss., limiting U. S. contributions to any international organization to not more than one-third of the total expenses of the organization (pp. 9145-7).

Agreed, 142-127, to an amendment by Rep. Jensen, Iowa, to permit the filling of only 25% of the vacancies that may occur during the fiscal year 1952, with certain exceptions (pp. 9147-8).

Rejected the following amendments:

By Rep. Clevenger, Ohio, to reduce by $15,000,000 the funds for international information and educational activities, by a vote of 136 to 167 (pp. 9114-27); and a motion by Rep. Clevenger to recommit the bill and make this change was also rejected, 141-245 (p. 9150).

By Rep. Phillips, Calif., to bar the use of any part of this appropriation to pay the salary of the head of any executive department who has represented a foreign country in its relations with the U. S., by a vote of 81-171 (pp. 9127-43).

By Rep. Ford, Mich., to reduce the number of chauffeurs employed by the agencies covered by the bill, by a vote of 91-121 (pp. 9143-5).

By Rep. Smith, Wis., to reduce by 25% the amounts available for publicity and propaganda work, by a vote of 154-154 (pp. 9148-9).

7. BALING TWINE. The Ways and Means Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report), H. R. 1005, to permit free importation of baling twine (p. D683).

O'CONOR]; and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOSEPH SAMUEL PERRY, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, August 2, 1951, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Joseph Samuel Perry, of Illinois, to be a United States district judge for the northern district of Illinois, vice Elwyn R. Shaw, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman; the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]; and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF CORNELIUS J. HARRINGTON, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, August 3, 1951, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Cornelius J. Harrington, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Illinois, to fill a new position. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman; the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]; and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any further routine matters to be presented? If not——

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that several committees are meeting and one or two conferences are in progress, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OPERATIONS OF SUPREME HEADQUARTERS, ALLIED POWERS IN EUROPE

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Massachusetts may proceed.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, although I was one of the nine members of the Foreign Relations Committee who went to Europe, I was unable to go to England, Germany, Spain, Italy, Greece, and Turkey and, therefore, will not make any comment on these areas, concerning which I am sure Senators will derive much valuable information from the other members of the committee. During the one week I was overseas I spent the bulk of my time in a study of the operations of the Supreme Headquarters, Allied Powers in Europe, which is the official name for the headquarters of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization which is commanded by General Eisenhower.

There are so many important aspects of this great undertaking that I will not attempt to cover them all at once, but intend to do so in several statements to be made as the debate progresses. Today I wish simply to comment on one question which will confront the Members of the Senate in connection with the proposed Mutual Security Act—and that is the amount of dollars to be authorized.

This bill as it now stands provides for a total authorization of $8,500,000,000, of which $5,200,000,000 is for the development of military strength in Europe.

There has been a good deal of talk about reducing this amount. Some proposals have been made to cut the proposed aid for the fiscal year 1952 in half or, stated in another way, to stretch it out over a period of 2 years instead of one. I had heard so much talk about these and similar proposals that I adressed a question to General Gruenther, who is General Eisenhower's chief of staff. The question was as follows:

> What would be the effect of cutting the proposed arms aid for the fiscal year 1952 in half, or stretching it out over a period of 2 years instead of 1?

In reply to this question, General Gruenther told me that the effect would be to reduce by one quarter the number of divisions planned for the end of 1952, which, according to my personal calculation, amounts to a 14-division loss. Insofar as air units are concerned, such a proposed cut, he said, would mean a reduction of 25 percent in the number of air squadrons planned for the fiscal year 1952. This, again according to my personal calculation, would mean a cutback of from 15 to 20 squadrons.

But General Gruenther went on to point out that damaging as these cutbacks in ground and air units would be, we could expect even more critical results from the proposed reduction. He explained how American military supply to the NATO countries has been based upon what each of these countries is committed to contribute to the NATO force. If we reduce our shipments of military matériel, this would obviously have drastic effects on the build-up which each country has already scheduled. General Gruenther further said:

> Several countries have already indicated great sensitivity to possibilities of cut-backs of this kind. The European countries do not have the strength and resilience which the United States possesses to tolerate sweeping fluctuations in programs once established, to which their conscription and production efforts are geared. They cannot stand the feast and famine to which the United States is accustomed.

I believe that is a point which we in this country are likely to overlook because our whole economy is so much stronger. We forget that many European countries exist on a so-called hand-to-mouth basis, living, one might say, in the shadow of the gallows. Therefore any program which involves our participation, and on which the European countries are planning, ought to be carried out, otherwise drastic consequences will ensue in those countries.

General Gruenther concluded with this warning:

> A severe crisis in confidence and a severe handicap, if not an actual undercutting of General Eisenhower, in the accomplishment of his mission with respect to inducing full efforts from these countries is the only consequence that can reasonably be expected.

Mr. President, these are impressive words. I say this as one who is keenly aware of the dangers of huge Government expenditures. Without in any way vaunting myself, I believe I have a constructive and helpful record as regards Goverment economy. There are indeed many cases in which Government expenditures are much better made at a moderate rate and over a long period of time. But military expenditures at this moment in history are definitely not in this category. I believe that at our present rate of military expenditures we are incurring all the draw-backs of an expensive military program without achieving the advantages in regained initiative, which after all is the purpose of any armament program. In the present world situation our military expenditures should be approached as one approaches an emergency operation; it should be done right away and as quickly as possible. The man who pays a thousand dollars for an automobile which will not run is actually not as well off as the man who pays twelve hundred dollars for an automobile which will take him where he wants to go. We should have a military program which will take us where we want to go, which is to the organization of a durable peace.

This mutual-assistance money is, of course, directly vital to the security of the United States, since it is an effective means of getting allies for us who in case of war would help carry the load of combat. Under the leadership of General Eisenhower an amazing amount of progress has been made. One of the finest staffs I have ever seen has been assembled. Although the force now in existence is still much too small, the distance that has been traveled since he first took over has been nothing short of miraculous. It would not surprise me at all if by next year all the thorniest problems had been solved so that all would be necessary thereafter

would be a steady build-up of strength. A short 6 months ago no one would have thought that such a condition would even be conceivable.

Mr. President, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is very much a going concern. It deserves our full support.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 33, line 1.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is any time for debate remaining on the amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into, the time for debate is equally divided, and it is controlled respectively by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. FERGUSON. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The VICE PRESIDENT. They have been ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. The time for debate has not yet expired, has it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; 30 minutes for debate are available, 15 minutes to each side. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] controls 15 minustes, and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] controls the other 15 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to make some remarks, but I should prefer to make them after a quorum call has been had, so that more Senators may be in attendance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no point of no quorum pending before the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Under the circumstances, I am compelled to to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan whether he would withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum. We just had a quorum call, and the call was rescinded. Two very important committees are in conference, and they are about ready to conclude their mission; at least, we hope so. I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Michigan would agree to proceed with the debate on the pending amendment, and then consent to have a quorum call before a vote is taken on the amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. The very purpose of having debate is to explain a subject to Senators, before they are asked to vote. I do not see any reason for debating a question for the benefit of the occupants of the galleries. They do not vote on questions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield some time to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be very glad to yield one-half of the time required to have a quorum call, provided the distinguished Senator from Georgia will yield the other half of the time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not understand the inquiry.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan made a point of no quorum. I would be willing to yield one-half of the time required to have a quorum call if the distinguished Senator from Georgia would yield the other half of the time.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is evident that we need a quorum. Is it necessary to yield time for the purpose of having a quorum call?

The VICE PRESIDENT. By unanimous consent the time required to have a quorum call could be excluded from the provisions of the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I make such a unanimous-consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the time consumed in the calling of the roll will not be charged to either side. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hennings	Monroney
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Moody
Bennett	Hill	Morse
Benton	Hoey	Mundt
Brewster	Holland	Murray
Bricker	Hunt	Neely
Bridges	Ives	Nixon
Butler, Md.	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Carlson	Kem	Robertson
Chavez	Kerr	Russell
Clements	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Connally	Knowland	Schoeppel
Cordon	Langer	Smathers
Dirksen	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Magnuson	Smith, N. C.
Eastland	Malone	Sparkman
Ecton	Martin	Stennis
Ellender	Maybank	Taft
Ferguson	McCarran	Underwood
Frear	McCarthy	Watkins
Gillette	McClellan	Wherry
Green	McFarland	Wiley
Hayden	McKellar	Williams
Hendrickson	Millikin	Young

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 33, in line 1.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I desired to have a quorum present before I spoke a few minutes on the amendment. However, I find fewer Senators now in the Chamber than were in the Chamber when I suggested the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time is under control. Has either Senator who is in charge of the time yielded to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not know that either one has yielded to me. I think those in control of the time have deserted the floor, and I am now asking to be recognized.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair cannot recognize any Senator unless either of the two Senators who are in control of the time yields time to such Senator.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, on behalf of the minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], I should like to yield to the Senator from Michigan as much time as he would like to have.

The VICE PRESIDENT. How much time does the Senator desire to have?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to speak until more Senators are on the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska has 15 minutes at his disposal.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield time to either the distinguished Senator from Maryland or the distinguished Senator from Michigan; and I shall yield to them whatever time they would like to have.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair cannot decide between those two Senators on the question of recognition.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield at this time 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the pending committee amendment is a very important one. Two amendments have been offered to this committee amendment, which calls for the appropriation of $280,000,000 for the 1952 program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conserving practices. That is a great sum of money, notwithstanding the fact that in Washington we are dealing in terms of billions of dollars. I am sure that as trustees for the tax funds which the American people pay into the Treasury of the United States, we are expected to treat $280,000,000 as a large sum of money, notwithstanding the great prosperity of the United States of America and notwithstanding the de-

preciation of the dollar in the United States. This sum does represent a very large amount of the taxpayers' money; and as trustees for those funds, I know that the taxpayers want us to see that the money is spent wisely and in such a way as to take care of the most essential items.

Yesterday in our consideration of this item, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] submitted to this committee amendment an amendment proposing to reduce the amount to $150,000,000. He submitted that amendment to the committee amendment after he had the expression of the head of the American Farm Bureau Federation, who speaks as a representative of the farmers, and that he was willing to have the amount reduced to $150,000,000. So I can understand why the Senator from Illinois offered such an amendment to the committee amendment. Yesterday, the vote on the amendment to reduce the appropriation to $150,000,000 was so close that the Senator from Michigan felt that the Senate would go along with an amendment making the figure $200,000,000; so he made that motion, and the vote was 37 to 38, a difference of one vote on this important question. The number of votes cast was small, in view of the great significance of these appropriation bills.

Daily requests come to us—I have some from the State of Michigan now—from people who desire and are anxious to testify before the Finance Committee, which is considering the tax bill. Citizens are coming to Washington in droves to testify before that committee, because they realize that the committee will draft a tax measure which will take their money away from them. But they forget that that is not at all the place where they should start. The place to start is before the committees which are authorizing the functions of the Government; because every time a committee authorizes a new function of the Government, and the Senate and House vote for the new function, it is going to cost the taxpayers money; and they ought to be here looking after their interests. Only twice in the 8½ years while I have been a member of the Appropriations Commitee, have I ever seen witnesses come before the Appropriations Committee to advocate reductions in appropriations. I hope that the public will realize that, instead of the committee which sonsiders the question of taxes, the Approprations Committee is the one which actually takes their tax dollars, after the Government levies the tax against them and puts the money in the bank, to be spent by the executive branch of the Government.

It is the placing of the money in the bank about which I want to talk today. If we put this $280,000,000 in the bank in the form of an appropriation, it will be drawn out, and the taxpayers will be required by a tax bill to pay taxes because of the expenditure of that $280,000,000. I hope they will not have to pay the $280,000,000.

Since the proposal to make the amount $150,000,000 and the subsequent proposal to make it $200,000,000 were defeated, the Senate should give the people back home an opportunity to vote on making the appropriation $225,000,000. This is not the only sum which is to be spent for conservation of the soil. As I stated yesterday, I am in favor of the conservation of land and soil. The farmers of America all understand it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. May I have three additional minutes?

Mr. YOUNG. As acting minority leader, to the extent of the time which remains, I yield the Senator from Michigan whatever time he may want.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I shall take but a few more minutes. There is another item in the bill which I wish to discuss. The one to which I have been adverting is not the only item for soil conservation. On page 29, line 9, we find an item of $53,474,991 under the head of Soil Conservation Service; so I think the Congress is very generous with respect to this Service.

In connection with the limitation on next year's appropriation for soil conservation, we are going to have to spend some money on dams in the Midwest, on the Missouri, Kansas, and other rivers, dams which are not provided for at all in this appropriation, items which are not even in the budget at the present time. I favor such expenditures, for I have recently visited the flooded areas in Kansas and Missouri, and have seen what happened.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Was not the distinguished Senator from Michigan one of the group of Senators who went into the flooded area and saw at first hand something of the devastation wrought as the result of a lack of some of these dams, the construction of which had been curtailed or stopped by reason of the determination and ruling that no new starts should be made?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. We saw at first hand the great devastation and great damage. As I say, I am for economy, I am for efficiency; but I think we ought to select for immediate action those things which come first; and I believe that now the dams even come ahead of the item of soil conservation. The floodwaters are not only washing away the soil, but they are washing away homes and factories. Therefore, I think all the States of the Union should realize that economy is necessary; and, instead of appropriating for next year $280,000,000, they should be willing to take $225,000,000. By doing so, $55,000,000 would be saved, and we would be performing our proper function as trustees of the taxpayers' money. Two hundred and twenty-five million dollars is exactly what the House allowed. I hope the farmers will cooperate with Senators, who are trustees of the funds not only of the farmers, but of all the people.

For the reasons stated I believe we should reject the committee amendment which would provide an appropriation of $280,000,000. If we reject the committee amendment, the amount of $225,000,000 as passed by the House will be restored. Those who want to make the appropriation $225,000,000 should vote "nay" on this committee amendment. A vote of "nay" will mean that the amount will be fixed at $225,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I wish to speak in favor of the Senate committee amendment increasing the appropriation from $225,000,000, as allowed by the House, to $280,000,000, as fixed by the Senate committee. This is one of the most vital items in this or any other bill. The program of soil conservation is a program to insure the future of our country. I am amazed at men who say, "I am in favor of conservation, but." Yes, they are in favor of conservation; but they seek to do that which would limit or destroy conservation.

Actually we do not need less than the $280,000,000 provided in this bill, for the security and welfare of our country; we need more. We are today one of the few nations who are able to produce enough meat and bread for their own people and have some available for export; but that condition cannot continue unless we have a more aggressive program of soil and water conservation.

I was interested in the remarks of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], in which he stated that we should place first things first. I ask, What is it that can come ahead of the fertility and the conservation and the rebuilding of the soil? The soil is the source of all our wealth; it is the source of all our health; it is the source of our national security. Unless the Government expands and makes its conservation program more aggressive, within 15 years this great Nation will be unable to feed its own citizens.

I say to the Senate that those who seek to reduce the conservation program would, if they succeeded, inflict on our Nation creeping paralysis. Those who seek to curtail the program, Mr. President, would, if successful, put around this Nation a stranglehold which would cripple and destroy it.

The fact is that those who do not live on farms have a greater interest in soil conservation than do those who do. Today, for every farm family producing food there are four nonfarm families dependent upon the one which is producing it. Unless we have more conservation instead of less conservation, the day is not far distant—it is not 15 years distant—when we shall be producing less food than our people need. When that day comes it will not be the farm families that will suffer, because when the shortage begins to arrive, when the pinch begins to be felt, it will be the nonfarm families that will feel it first. That will be a day when there will be weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth on the part of those who have permitted or been a party to the destruction of the program to maintain the fertility of our soil from which our food and feed and fiber come.

In that day the American people will rise up and put a curse on those who have sought to cripple the conservation program by steadily reducing the incentive to conserve the soil. In that day, Mr. President, they will rise up and call blessed those who had the vision and the courage to fight for and maintain the program that will preserve the quality and the fertility of the soil from which our sustenance must come.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who has served his country ably and with great distinction as Secretary of Agriculture, and who is thoroughly familiar with the details of the conservation program.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have no desire to argue with those who think there needs to be economy in many parts of the Government, but I say to them that if there is one place where it is unwise to be pressing for additional economy it is in the conservation program. I am particularly interested in it because, at the close of the last war, there was a great deal of comment about the number of acres in this country formerly in pasture which had been plowed up, and had been placed in cultivation after World War I and during World War II. We could look at the soil in the State of Iowa and count the acres, not in tens but in millions, which had formerly been in productive pasture, in the type of cultivation which is easiest on the soil, a cover crop which is needed to cure the ravages caused by intensive cultivation. Those acres had been plowed up and placed in corn, because this country needed that particular product.

We could follow the same pattern in the State of Illinois and in areas in the Southwest where alfalfa had been plowed up and other crops had been planted in its place. Everyone was saying, "As soon as World War II is over we will proceed to put the land back into pasture. We will put it into something that is easy on the soil. We will bind up the wounds the soil suffered during the war. We shall do it at the earliest possible moment."

It happened that it never was possible to put the land back into pasture. When World War II ended there followed a greater food-deficit period than the world had ever before known. Every available acre of soil had to be devoted to the cultivation of grain needed for food cereals for the sustenance of peoples all around the earth. We could not say we would have only one type of grain; we needed different types for various parts of the world, because there are some countries in which the principal food supply is from wheat, and there are other places where the people do not use wheat at all, but use corn. Therefore, we put the burden back again upon our acres for the development of the agricultural products so sorely needed, and they were devoted to that use year after year, because 1946, 1947, and 1948, or at least a great part of 1948, constituted a food-deficit period throughout our Nation and throughout the world.

When we emerged from that situation we said, "We will now be sure we have enough money for soil conservation." Yet no one is suggesting that we go back to the time when $500,000,000 was made available for the program. Surely if we are going to put tremendous acreages back into pasture we should have $500,000,000, but the appropriation never has been above $300,000,000. The committee is trying to make the amount $280,000,000, which I think is low enough. There is no place where money is more needed than in this conservation program. I think it would be absolutely unwise to reduce the appropriation recommended by the committee. I have not hesitated in the slightest to cast my vote against amendments that would reduce it, because I remember the experiences of 1947.

In 1947 the Congress of the United States, in an economy wave, decided to trim the conservation program, and it reduced the amount to $150,000,000, and served notice that that would be the last year there would be a conservation program. It was then my responsibility, as Secretary of Agriculture, to go before the committees of the Congress and plead with them not to reduce the appropriation and not to leave a death Sentence hanging over the agriculture conservation program.

I think the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] was probably the strongest arm the Department of Agriculture had in that fight to make sure that the soil-conservation program was not abandoned. I can testify of my own personal knowledge to the things he did.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield the Senator from New Mexico two more minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I desire to use one more minute, because I am looking across the chamber at other Senators who assisted the Senator from Georgia. I am referring to the Senators from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER and Mr. YOUNG].

The Department of Agriculture made its fight, but we lost, and an economy-minded Congress destroyed a part of the soil-conservation program. I remember that some of the Members who helped to destroy it paid the penalty the next time they went back to their constituents and talked to them. I am wishing everyone well in his body, but the quickest way for Senators to hurt themselves and their communities is to destroy the agricultural conservation program.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there are just a few matters I want to have in the RECORD in order that it may be complete. I wish, first, to state that the entire amount involved in the committee amendment of $280,000,000 is twenty-nine one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total budget submitted to the Congress of the United States this year. The $55,000,000 involved in the amendment which will be in issue in the vote is six one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total budget.

Mr. President, in a budget which carries billions and billions of dollars for national defense, for creating weapons of destruction, can we afford in the name of economy to seize on six one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total budget dedicated to the constructive purpose of conserving the soils of the Nation?

The distinguished Senator from New Mexico referred to the reduction in the appropriation which took place in 1947, in the Eightieth Congress. I appreciate his kindly references to me and to my activities and efforts, and I wish to commend what he said with reference to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] in respect to the fight which was carried on to salvage something out of wreckage of the program.

But when this program was cut to $150,000,000 in 1947 for the calendar year 1948, the number of individual conservation practices carried out fell off 27 percent from the number in 1947. Sixteen percent of the farms dropped altogether from the conservation program. The farmer was better off financially in the year 1947 than he is today when we consider his relative share of the national income.

Farm prices have gone down consistently since 1947. Yet at this particular juncture, it is proposed to dump all the responsibility upon the farmer, representing less than 20 percent of the total population, for carrying out a conservation program which is of vital importance to 100 percent of the people who live within the United States.

I should also like to state for the benefit of the RECORD, Mr. President, that the program next year, even if the committee amendment is adopted, will require an additional expenditure of $32,000,000 by the farmer, because of the increased cost of conservation practices. The increased cost of the material, of the machinery, of work, of labor, has already added $32,000,000 to what the farmer will be compelled to spend in 1952 as compared with 1950, even if the Senate committee amendment be adopted.

Mr. President, those facts should be in the RECORD. I know that Senators tire of hearing me discuss this conservation problem, but I do so because I am firmly convinced that it is of vital importance to the future of the Nation. There are some specific figures I wish to place in the RECORD before the vote is had.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, at this point, a statement showing that the acreage harvested has declined from 3.3 acres per capita in 1920 to 2.2 acres per capita in 1950, and that by 1980 only 1.9 acres will be harvested per person.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR RUSSELL

We have been using our agricultural resources too hard for too long. We now realize

that what we once considered as unlimited resources are limited. There is a definite limit to our cropland, and there is no place to go if we wear out the farms we now have. As population increases, a smaller acreage will have to produce the food and fiber required for each person. The acreage harvested in 1920 was 3.3 per capita. The comparable figure for 1950, using preliminary census figures, is 2.2. This means there is one-third less acreage producing the needs of each person. By 1980, when statisticians tell us that population will reach its peak, there will be only 1.9 acres per person.

Most of the Members of the Senate probably have seen figures about the actual losses of soil so I shall not go into that detail. I would like to mention that, even with the widespread use of conservation farming we have today, we are losing outright about one-half million acres of cropland a year, and suffering heavy losses on soil that is not completely taken out of production.

For too long we have, without realizing it, let soil fertility get away from us. Loss of fertility cannot be seen, while erosion itself can be pictured graphically. It is just as important to maintain fertility as it is to keep the soil in place.

We are one of the strongest nations in the world. We have been able to maintain our position in international affairs largely because of the high levels of production which American agriculture has been able to achieve. We have given assistance to nations fighting for democracy—assistance of food and other materials. We shall not be able to hold our international position if soil becomes depleted or if our natural resources become exhausted.

Mr. YOUNG. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hennings	Monroney
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Moody
Bennett	Hill	Morse
Benton	Hoey	Mundt
Brewster	Holland	Neely
Bricker	Hunt	Nixon
Bridges	Ives	O'Conor
Butler, Md.	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Carlson	Kem	Russell
Chavez	Kerr	Saltonstall
Clements	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Connally	Knowland	Smathers
Cordon	Langer	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Lodge	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Magnuson	Sparkman
Eastland	Malone	Stennis
Ecton	Martin	Taft
Ellender	Maybank	Underwood
Ferguson	McCarran	Watkins
Frear	McCarthy	Wherry
Gillette	McClellan	Wiley
Green	McFarland	Williams
Hayden	McKellar	Young
Hendrickson	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 33, line 1. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired.

Mr. YOUNG. I understood there were 6 minutes left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The quorum call used up the 6 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As I understand, the vote on the committee amendment involves an increase in the authorization for 1952–53, from $225,000,000 to $280,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has correctly stated the figures.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 33, line 1. All time for debate on this amendment on both sides has expired. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

On this vote the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshre would vote "nay" and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—41

Aiken	Eastland	Holland
Anderson	Ellender	Johnson, Colo.
Benton	Green	Johnson, Tex.
Carlson	Hayden	Johnston, S. C.
Chavez	Hennings	Kerr
Clements	Hill	Kilgore
Connally	Hoey	Langer
Lehman	Monroney	Smathers
Magnuson	Morse	Sparkman
Maybank	Mundt	Stennis
McCarran	Neely	Underwood
McClellan	Pastore	Wiley
McFarland	Russell	Young
McKellar	Schoeppel	

NAYS—39

Bennett	Frear	Moody
Brewster	Gillette	Nixon
Bricker	Hendrickson	O'Conor
Bridges	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Butler, Md.	Hunt	Robertson
Byrd	Ives	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kem	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Lodge	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Malone	Taft
Dworshak	Martin	Watkins
Ecton	McCarthy	Wherry
Ferguson	Millikin	Williams

NOT VOTING—16

Butler, Nebr.	George	Murray
Cain	Humphrey	Thye
Case	Jenner	Tobey
Duff	Kefauver	Welker
Flanders	Long	
Fulbright	McMahon	

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2192) to amend section 313 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I inquire whether an amendment on page 35, lines 20 and 21, would now be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. Committee amendments are now being considered. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was on page 33, in line 18, after the word "further", to strike out:

That not to exceed 5 percent of the allocation for the agricultural conservation program for any county may be allotted with the approval of the State committee to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program and the funds so allotted shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such county.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

That not to exceed 5 percent of the allocation for the agricultural conservation program for any county may, on the recommendation of such county committee and approval of the State committee, be withheld and allotted to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program in the participating counties, and the funds so allotted may be placed in a single account for each State, and shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such counties.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Agricultural production programs", on page 35, line 20, after the word "commodities", to strike out "$8,300,000" and insert "$12,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as 7-25-51 F.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has been recognized for the purpose of offering an amendment. For what purpose does the Senator from Georgia rise?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Chair—and I do not know whether I should do it by way of a point of order—that the amendment on page 31 was passed over temporarily. In my judgment action should be taken on that amendment before we proceed to another page. It was passed over temporarily yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that two or three amendments were passed over. The Senator from Georgia may call up such amendment as he sees fit.

Mr. RUSSELL. We may as well dispose of the soil-conservation item first. Therefore, if it is in order, I ask that we proceed to the consideration of the amendment on page 31, line 15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 31, line 15.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In that event, I call up my amendment identified as 7-25-51-G.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 31, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "$280,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$259,250,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the issue involved here is that of accumulated reserves. In the past year the Appropriations Committee discovered, I believe, that the Production and Marketing Administration had accumulated reserves available from prior year operations of $25,750,000. That had not been stated to the Congress when the Bureau of the Budget asked for the appropriation. It was used by the Bureau of the Budget, I believe in its internal negotiations with the Department of Agriculture, but it was not revealed to the Congress. I believe I am correct in saying that the Appropriations Committee discovered this situation as a result of the section 1214 reduction and made it a matter of public record.

It was because of this fact that the House reduced the total to $256,500,000, in the belief that if there were unspent reserves for the year 1949-50 which the Bureau of the Budget could use to make the section 1214 cut, there would probably be unspent reserves for the fiscal year 1950-51 which Congress could use. The House, therefore carried over an accumulated reserve estimated at the same level as last year, which was $25,750,000, together with the appropriation of $256,500,000 for this year, to make a total of $282,250,000, rather than to appropriate $282,250,000 for this year and thus, with the $25,750,000 unspent for the past year, have a total of $308,000,000.

Thus the $256,500,000 voted by the House, plus an estimated accumulated reserve from prior year operations of $25,750,000, which is what the carry-over was last year, allows a total of $282,250,000. This is the same level of spending as that allowed last year.

However, the authorization carried in the bill last year amounted to $285,000,000, so the amount voted by the House would lack $2,750,000 of being enough to carry out the commitments which were authorized.

My amendment allows an extra $2,750,000 so that the full commitment will be available. If the amount of the accumulated reserve for 1950-51 falls below the amounts accumulated during the year 1949-50, then the Production and Marketing Administration can borrow from the Commodity Credit Corporation to make up the difference.

Of course, if Congress appropriates money for a Government agency, the tendency of the agency is to spend the money. If in the past there have been unobligated reserves which the agency has not fully revealed to the Congress, I believe it is a good plan for the Congress to reduce the appropriations in the future, so that the temptation to spend will be avoided.

If the Production and Marketing Administration gets into trouble because of a shortage of funds, it is my understanding that it can always borrow from the Commodity Credit Corporation in order to be able to meet any commitments which it may have made.

For these reasons, Mr. President, it seems to me to be prudent that we follow the example set by the House of Representatives.

I have made a slight adjustment in the House figure, allowing a cut of about $21,000,000, instead of a cut of $23,000,000.

Mr. President, unless there is good evidence to the contrary, it seems to me that the amendment I propose to the committee amendment is a sound one.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Illinois said that if the Production and Marketing Administration got into trouble, it could borrow.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. That agency would not even have to get into trouble in order to be able to borrow. When Congress passed what is known as section 1214 of the General Appropriation Act, last year, authorizing and directing the President to make reductions in the budget, he cut from this particular item the sum of $25,750,000. After the President made that cut, this agency went to the Commodity Credit Corporation and borrowed the money.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Michigan mean to say that the Production and Marketing Administration disregarded the decision of the President and went behind his back and borrowed, in order to make good a cut which had been made by the Bureau of the Budget in its appropriation?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is exactly what I mean to say, and that is exactly what happened.

I thought the Senator from Illinois was merely attempting to restore the $25,750,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am trying to see to it that the taxpayer rather than the agency is given the accumulated reserves.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to read from page 96 of the side slips, in connection with this matter:

> The maximum amount which may be borrowed from the Commodity Credit Corporation during any fiscal year is $50,000,000. It was necessary to increase the borrowing in 1951 by $27,750,000 (to a total of $40,750,000) to offset the cut pursuant to section 1214 of the 1951 General Appropriation Act, so that the Government could meet its commitments under the 1950 program in full and have sufficient funds for advance purchases of conservation materials and services to be used in connection with the 1951 program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then I take it that the Senator from Michigan is supporting the amendment which I have proposed to the committee amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. I certainly am.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there seems to be considerable confusion in regard to this item. What actually happened was that under section 1214 of the omnibus appropriation bill the President was instructed to reduce the appropriations in a total amount of $500,000,000. The Production and Marketing Administration had a carry-over or unexpended funds from prior years amounting to $26,000,000. Under the specific language of section 1214 of the General Appropriations Act the President was directed to take the $500,000,000 out of the appropriations for the current year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the eminent Senator from Georgia yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the able and eminent Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Georgia inform us whether Congress at the time it made the appropriation last year knew that the Production and Marketing Administration had unexpended appropriations in the amount of approximately $26,000,000?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I did not know that the Congress was aware of the exact amount.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Had the Production and Marketing Administration and the Department of Agriculture told the Congress that?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am of the impression—and I shall ask the clerk of the committee to consult with the budget in this connection—that the report submitted to Congress by the Bureau of the Budget did show that this agency had a carry-over of funds. It is not unusual

for it to have a slight carry-over in these funds. In some years the farmers do not carry out as many practices as they do in others, and sometimes there have been slight savings in administrative expenses.

Mr. President, I wish to say that in my judgment it is to the credit of an administrator to carry over a part of an appropriation. I have been a member of the Appropriations Committee for some time, and I have seen quite a few budgets go by, but I have never been able to understand the philosophy of a committee or of the Senate when it seeks to penalize an administrator because he did not spend all the money which Congress had appropriated. That very idea has encouraged more extravagance in the operations of the Government of the United States than has any other single thing, because when an appropriation is made for an agency and when the administrator of the agency comes to the end of the fiscal year and, because he has been a prudent man, has a carry-over, which he could return to the Treasury, he knows that if he comes before the congressional committees and says, "I have been able to save this much money out of my appropriation," the Congress will reduce the appropriation for his agency. So most administrators hurriedly try to commit every dollar of their carry-overs, so that they can testify before the committees, "We have no carry-over of funds."

It would be a wise economy move and would save the expenditure of millions of dollars each year, in my opinion, if Congress had some method of rewarding administrative heads who are able to testify before the congressional committees, "I have tried to be prudent with the funds appropriated to me, and I am carrying over this much money to next year." However, the administrative heads dare not do that, because they know that if they do, Congress will immediately cut their appropriations. That is not directly involved in this item, but it is a belief I have had for many years.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Georgia referred yesterday to the subsidy to industry for new construction. On checking the amount of that subsidy this morning, I find that, up to July 3 the subsidy to industry in the form of tax deferments amounted to approximately $7,600,000,000. If that amount is not paid into the Treasury by the concerns which have had their taxes deferred, obviously the $7,600,000,000 must come from other people who pay taxes.

If the Senator will examine the report of the staff of the Select Committee of the Senate on Small Business, he will note that the staff reported to the committee that, although less than 10 percent of the facilities of General Motors Corp. is now devoted to defense production, this corporation nevertheless, at a cost of more than $250,000,000, is constructing 41 completely new plants which, when erected, will be devoted to defense production.

The question I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia is this: Why is it that men will rise in a public forum to fight as if their lives depended on it to cut $30,000,000 or $40,000,000 from a farm program, yet they will not raise a hand or lift a voice to question a $7,600,000,000 subsidy to industry? I should like to have an answer to that question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I cannot answer the question. I am not wise enough to answer it. I only know that the wisdom of General Motors in staying out of the farming business and confining itself to industrial production is made eminently manifest by the fact that General Motors is able to secure such amortization benefits without incurring the wrath of the Congress by taking a direct appropriation as in the case of appropriations for agriculture.

Mr. DOUGLAS rose.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have very limited time, and I think I ought to clarify this item.

The expendable balance of approximately $26,000,000 was carried over. The Budget Bureau, in trying to find items to make up the $500,000,000, which was the amount of reduction the Congress directed should be made in the total appropriations, could not take the carry-over, so the Budget Bureau took the $26,000,000 unexpended balance of the appropriation for 1951, and let the carry-over come in the supplemental appropriation. I am frank to confess that that was the use of a mechanism which had the effect of defeating a directive of the Congress with respect to that amount of money; but it was not done by the Production and Marketing Administration, it was done by the Budget Bureau Director.

Mr. President, reference has been made to the power to borrow from the Commodity Credit Corporation, which organization came into existence for a very simple, definite, and, I think, well-reasoned purpose. The appropriation which we are considering is for this calendar year's funds. A great many of the conservation practices, such as buying trees for planting in the spring, or buying seed for planting in the spring, are of tremendous importance. The appropriation being on an annual basis, there were no funds available for the spring assistance, so the Congress passed an act—if it was a vicious thing, the Congress did it—authorizing the PMA Administration to borrow up to $50,000,000 from the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purchase of materials needed in the spring for purposes of conservation, the amount to be repaid later out of that current year's appropriation. That is exactly where the borrowing from the Commodity Credit Corporation comes in. It was done under the directive of the Congress in order to make the program effective. The item which we have before us comes here by virtue of a directive of the Congress. I read from the appropriation bill for last year, under the item of "Production and Marketing Administration," wherein Congress directed the Department of Agriculture to undertake a conservation program of $283,000,000 for 1951; that is, for this year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining? I want to yield, but my time is very limited, and I think I ought to explain this item.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have a very limited question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it the contention of the Senator from Georgia that, unless we appropriate $280,000,000, the Government will not be living up to its contracts with farmers and others; in other words, that we have committed ourselves to this amount?

Mr. RUSSELL. We are undoubtedly committed to the discharge of all the obligations incurred this year, within the limit of $282,500,000, because the Congress directed that a program not in excess of that amount be followed for 1951.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Georgia is an extremely honorable man.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. I try to be honorable.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it the Senator's statement, based upon investigation, that unless we authorize $280,000,000, as opposed to $225,000,000, the Congress will not then be living up to its word?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, I would not make that definite statement. There may be $5,000,000, $6,000,000, or $7,000,000 for practices which will not be followed, or for which the amounts will be more than adequate. I could not say it would require exactly $280,000,000, because there have been some carry-overs in the past as the Senator from Illinois pointed out. I think the carry-overs amounted one year to approximately $17,000,000, and this year, because we have urged the farmers to increase their production, they may have removed a good deal of land from soil conservation practices, and planted it back to wheat, corn, cotton, or some other commodity; and there may be a carry-over next year. If there is, it will not be spent. But this Congress has an obligation, because last year we directed the adoption of a program up to $282,500,000; and we have an obligation to pay all the money due for practices. We have been contending here over next year's program. That was one thing. We are setting the pattern for next year's program; but the item with which the pending amendment deals has to do with the payment for this year's practices, which were carried out pursuant to a contract between the farmer and his Government, under the directive issued by the Congress in the appropriation bill last year.

That is exactly what is involved in this committee amendment, because the amendment is intended to carry out the

commitment for this year, made pursuant to a directive of Congress in last year's appropriation bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator knows how I feel about soil conservation, but I should like to have a definite answer as to whether the total amount which is mentioned in this section will be used to discharge and to respect the commitments already made by the Government to the farmers, or whether any part of the appropriation can be used for undertaking new projects.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not a dime can be used for undertaking new projects. If it is not required to discharge the agreements already made with the farmers, it will be an unexpended appropriation, and it will either revert to the Treasury next year, or the Congress can apply it on the payment of next year's appropriation for the conservation program.

Mr. LEHMAN. In other words, it is to be used exclusively in making good on commitments already made, is it?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is to be used in making good commitments for the calendar year 1951. Let us bear in mind that this program operates on a calendar year basis, not on a fiscal year basis. The Senator from Illinois says that the amount recommended might not be needed. I concede that all of it may not be needed. I would not say categorically that the administration will need all of it, because they may not need all of it, and perhaps some will be carried over. The entire appropriation will not be spent unless the practices followed in soil conservation are carried out. The Department has carried over appropriations from year to year as the result of saying that practices did not conform to the requirements, or because the farmers did not adopt efficient practices; which shows that the Department has not used unwisely, or thrown away the dollars we have appropriated. I say it would be to the credit of the administrator were he to come to Congress next year and say, "You appropriated $280,000,000, pursuant to the $282,500,000 commitment, but we find that $6,000,000 worth of practices did not come up to the standards we had prescribed. There was $6,000,000 the farmers did not use because they have taken their lands out of conservation uses and put them into cultivation uses."

Let us say there may be $13,000,000 of carry-over. I am using these figures only for illustration. But the money which has been committed to participants in the program should, in good faith, be paid. While Congress has from time to time cut down on the program, it has never failed to meet commitments made to the American farmers.

In my opinion, this appropriation should not be reduced. If it is not needed, the money will not be spent; it will be available, and we can appropriate for next year to pay on the authorization which we adopted a few moments ago. But I think the question of good faith is clearly involved. When Congress has authorized a program, it is our obligation to fulfill it.

It may be said that there can be a deficiency appropriation, but how can we handle that? Are we going to say, "We lack 10 percent of having enough to pay the farmers"? Then the Department must go all over the bookkeeping, rewrite all the checks, cut 10 percent off, then wait until a deficiency appropriation is made available for the remainder. By proceeding in that way we would spend more in administrative expenses than we would ever save by reducing the appropriation as proposed. Furthermore, great confusion would be caused.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield me a few minutes?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I desire to correct one figure. I used the figure $25,750,000, when it should have been $26,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. I knew it was $26,000,000 to which the Senator had reference.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wanted to correct the RECORD in that respect.

Mr. President, a summary of what would happen if the House figures were adopted may be found on the side slips. I first desire to point out that, as I recall the testimony, we have no definite figures of what the carry-over this year will be. If we had, we could figure out what could be reduced from the amount by using the carry-over to pay the bill. I think the House figures are justified on the basis that there will be a carry-over, and also on the basis that if the carry-over is not sufficient, money can be borrowed from the Commodity Credit Corporation to cover the deficiency even though we place the figure at the amount suggested by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely wish to point out, with respect to the Senator's statement regarding the carry-over, that all the carry-over was absorbed through the rather devious financing which took place under section 1214. There was a carry-over, but when the money was taken out of the appropriation, they had to use it to pay the farmers for 1950. So there is no carry-over.

Mr. FERGUSON. They used $17,000,000 of the carry-over to pay into the fund.

Mr. RUSSELL. And the remainder to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan cannot find the definite amount for 1952 as proposed in the House bill. It is lower than the figure suggested by the Senator from Illinois. His figure is $259,250,000. I read:

Repayment of loan from CCC obtained in fiscal year 1951 (the remainder of the $40,750,000 borrowed in 1951 was repayed from prior year unobligated balances) $23,750,000.

National, State, and county committee expenses $25,250,000.

Net program funds available, $267,500,000.

Of the $256,500,000, made available by the House, $231,250,000 is for assistance to farmers in carrying approved conservation practices under the 1951 agricultural conservation program and for advances of conservation materials and services under the 1952 agricultural conservation program. The budget estimate included $259,750,000 for that purpose. The maximum amount which may be borrowed from the Commodity Credit Corporation during any fiscal year is $50,000,000. It was necessary to increase the borrowing in 1951 by $25,750,000 to a total of $40,750,000, to offset the cut pursuant to section 1214 of the 1951 General Appropriation Act, so that the Government could meet its commitments under the 1950 program in full and have sufficient funds for advance purchases of conservation materials and services to be used in connection with the 1951 program.

With the reductions proposed in the House bill, borrowing the maximum amount authorized from the Commodity Credit Corporation ($50,000,000) during the fiscal year 1952 would not be sufficient for advance purchases of conservation materials and services. It is estimated that $64,800,000 will be required during the fiscal year 1952 for this purpose. This is $2,250,000 more than the amount which would be available, including borrowings from the Commodity Credit Corporation.

So that with the Douglas amendment, which is $3,000,000 higher than the amount approved by the House, there would still be a surplus of $750,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. In all fairness, the Senator should state to the Senate that the figures he has been reading are figures produced by the House committee. They are for the purpose of justifying the reduction in the appropriation. They are the House committee's justification for the reduction in the appropriation.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the Senator will look on page 96 I believe he will find that they are the agency's justification for the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the way the House figures it.

Mr. FERGUSON. But it is also the justification by the agency; so that the Douglas amendment will give them a surplus of $750,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, that is so if they do not repay their borrowings from the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Under the provisions of the bill they are going to repay their borrowings.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is, after they use all the $50,000,000 borrowing power.

Mr. FERGUSON. They used it this year in violation of the law, after the President of the United States was requested to cut the budget. They borrowed the money to pay the $26,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is not a fair statement. The Bureau of the Budget directed the Production and Marketing Administration to do this, so that if there was any violation of the law it was not on the part of the Department of Agriculure; it was on the part of the Bureau of the Budget, because the bureau directed them to borrow the money from the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Bureau of the Budget was operating for the President of the United States, and the President

of the United States, in compliance with section 1214 of the law, cut the amount $56,000,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I want to deal with the claim of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that if this amendment is agreed to the Government will not be able to meet its commitments. I do not think that is quite a correct statement. There will be enough money to meet commitments. If there is not enough money, the Department of Agriculture can go to the Commodity Credit Corporation and borrow, and it will not be necessary to have a deficiency appropriation. But in view of the fact that the Department of Agriculture has been less than frank in its dealings with the Congress in the matter of accumulated reserves, it seems to me unwise to entrust them with money which they may not need.

The Senator from Georgia says that if a department saves money, it should not be taken away from it; it should be allowed to have it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not say that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator implied it was a wrong policy——

Mr. RUSSELL. I said it was commendatory for an administrative official to save money.

Mr. DOUGLAS. My position is that it should not be taken from the taxpayers in the form of a similar appropriation for next year. Any administrator should feel proud to be able to send money back to the Treasury, instead of feeling that he was being deprived of it.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is exactly what I said; that he should be proud of it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then the Senator from Georgia is supporting my amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not supporting the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate on the amendment has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is an amendment to the Douglas amendment in order at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not. Such an amendment would be an amendment in the third degree.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Douglas amendment an amendment in the second degree?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, the Douglas amendment is an amendment in the second degree.

Mr. WHERRY. Is not the Douglas amendment an amendment to the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the Senator from Nebraska is correct.

The yeas and nays have been requested.

Mr. FERGUSON. I join in asking for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have asked a question, and I do not believe it has been answered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood he had ruled on the Senator's inquiry. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that the committee amendment is an amendment in the first degree, and that the Douglas amendment is an amendment in the second degree.

Mr. WHERRY. The only opportunity there would be for further debate would be to ask unanimous consent that the time be extended, and I shall not make such a request. I wish we had obtained figures which the distinguished Senator from Georgia could have presented to the Senate showing how the Senate committee figures differ from those of the House, because we certainly have to provide for payment of contract obligations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment on page 31, line 15. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], if present and voting, would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official business.

On this vote the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—24

Bennett	Ferguson	Millikin
Brewster	Frear	Nixon
Bricker	Hendrickson	Robertson
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Smith, Maine
Butler, Md.	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Knowland	Taft
Dirksen	Lodge	Watkins
Douglas	Martin	Williams

NAYS—52

Aiken	Hunt	Morse
Anderson	Johnson, Colo.	Mundt
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Clements	Kem	O'Mahoney
Connally	Kerr	Pastore
Cordon	Langer	Russell
Dworshak	Lehman	Saltonstall
Eastland	Magnuson	Schoeppel
Ecton	Malone	Smathers
Ellender	Maybank	Smith, N. C.
Gillette	McCarran	Sparkman
Green	McCarthy	Stennis
Hayden	McClellan	Underwood
Hennings	McFarland	Wherry
Hill	McKellar	Young
Hoey	Monroney	
Holland	Moody	

NOT VOTING—20

Benton	Fulbright	McMahon
Butler, Nebr.	George	Murray
Cain	Humphrey	Thye
Case	Jenner	Tobey
Chavez	Kefauver	Welker
Duff	Kilgore	Wiley
Flanders	Long	

So Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEM, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. FERGUSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "7-25-51-H" and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is still the committee amendment on page 31, line 15.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair state the question. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 31, line 15, to strike out the figure "$256,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$280,000,000."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment on page 31, line 15, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 31, line 15, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out "$280,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$275,000,000."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this amendment providing for a cut of $5,-

000,000 is based upon the testimony of Mr. Geissler, Administrator of the Production and Marketing Administration of the Department of Agriculture. I read from the testimony. Mr. Roberts, the Director of Finance and Budget Policy, made the following statement:

Mr. ROBERTS. So that it seems to me, to answer the chairman's question, that an increase of the $256.5 million to somewhere in the neighborhood of $259,000,000 or $260,000,000, if interest has to be met, would still enable you to meet commitments on this year's program and make necessary advances on next year's program.

Mr. GEISSLER. By using the full borrowing authority.

Senator RUSSELL. That was the question I was asking, and if we got as much as $270,000,000 it would enable you to meet it, and you would not be compelled to utilize all of the borrowing capacity.

Mr. GEISSLER. That is right.

The Senator from Michigan, instead of making the figure $270,000,000, is proposing to put it up to $275,000,000, so there can be no question that the needs can be met. There is a probability that they can be met without the utilization of the borrowing capacity.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question that we could make this reduction by using the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation and do no violence to the payment of funds. There is no question about that. The Production and Marketing Administration must pay 1¼ percent to the Commodity Credit Corporation on any funds carried over. If it were necessary to carry over any of the funds, there would be that much taken out of the money appropriated for soil-conservation payments to pay interest. There is no question that we could make this reduction by using the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation. However, that is a form of "kiting" such as the Senator from Michigan so strongly condemns when carried on by the Budget Bureau, when it took $26,000,000 out of the appropriation. It is not so bad in degree, but it is along the same line.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan does not agree that it is the same kind of "kiting" that was done by the President and the Budget Director and the Department of Agriculture.

Let me repeat for the benefit of Senators who may not have been in the Chamber when I made my previous statement, that last year we enacted a law containing what is known as section 1214. The Senator from Michigan, among other Senators, supported that provision, which directed the President of the United States to make a general cut of $550,000,000 from the budget. One of the items he saw fit to cut was $26,000,000 from this particular item. He cut $26,000,000 from the item, and therefore complied with the statute. However, the Department of Agriculture, instead of really accepting the cut, accepted it only in theory, and went to the Commodity Credit Corporation and borrowed that amount of money. Therefore, it did not make the cut at all.

In other words, the section of the law to which I refer was violated. Today we are asked to restore the $26,000,000 which we directed, by legislation, be cut out last year. That is the kind of financing which we are doing. I say that if it can be called "kiting," certainly what was done in violation of the law was really "kiting."

The distinguished Senator from Georgia indicated that if this amount is now cut by $5,000,000, the farmer will in no way be harmed. He will receive his full payments. The only result will be that it will be a signal that it does not appear that Congress can do much more. We enacted a law, and it was violated. But let us again say, "We want you to try to economize, and, if it is possible, to get along with $275,000,000." If it is not possible, as the Senator from Georgia says, the administration can use its borrowing power. It may pay us to pay a few dollars of interest, as a warning that we really want the administration to get along on this amount of money.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to make a very brief observation in the Senator's time.

I commend the Senator for his efforts, although they have not been very successful to date.

It seems to me that the Nation is faced with a very critical situation at the present time. We have a budget of more than $71,000,000,000. The President is talking about submitting a supplementary budget for military aid and other programs in the amount of perhaps $20,000,000,000. Many persons believe that the budget may reach $100,000,000,000.

The President has asked for $10,000,000,000 in additional taxes. We have not been successful in making the reductions in appropriations which have been proposed. It looks to me as though the budget of the United States is setting up a chain reaction, and that the budget is controlling the Government of the United States, instead of the Government of the United States controlling the budget.

One of the greatest inflationary factors today is the Government's spending. I hope that at least to the extent of this small amount of $5,000,000 we may once again get back on the track, and thus say to the American people that we are going to start making some small reductions in the swollen costs of the Government.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator from California. As I said before on the floor of the Senate, we are trustees for the tax dollars of the American people. As trustees I believe it to be our solemn duty to do something in the way of cutting the budget. The time has come when we cannot allow the budget to control Congress. We in Congress must act in accordance with our duties as trustees. If this appropriation is cut, as my amendment proposes, it will not do violence to any contract, as has been stated by the chairman of the subcommittee. It will be a warning to the administration that Congress really feels that some action must be taken.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the amendment of the Senator from Michigan were increased by $5,000,000, making the total amount $10,000,000, does he feel, based on the testimony, that the contracts could still be made without borrowing?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. It could be cut by $10,000,000, instead of $5,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Massachusetts said "without borrowing."

Mr. FERGUSON. There is no assurance that the reduction in the appropriation could be increased to $10,000,000 without borrowing. From the figures I have been able to get, I am certain that the program can be carried on with $275,000,000, and very little borrowing, if any, would have to be done. I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I request the yeas and nays.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, has the Senator from Georgia consumed any of his time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. RUSSELL. I had not intended to speak on the amendment. I am sure Senators are becoming a little tired of hearing from me.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask a question of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in his own time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should be very glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Georgia will remember that I attended the hearing on the occasion when the subcommittee marked up the bill. I was in disagreement with the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], because I felt that obligations existed under the contracts. I felt that the time to settle with the farmer is when the authorizations are made. The authorization was made for $280,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. $282,500,000 this year.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. That must be paid. Contracts have already been entered into. We are not talking about any program for next year. We are talking about what we must do this year.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator whether it is not true that when the Bureau of the Budget made the cut, at the President's request, the amount was reduced to $256,000,000, and therefore it was necessary to go to the Commodity Credit Corporation to borrow the money in order to keep faith with the farmers on last year's contracts.

Mr. RUSSELL. That was my impression from the hearing which the Senator from Nebraska attended. I made further inquiry into the subject. It was in the nature of a kiting operation, but it was not exactly as I had understood it to be. The facts in the matter were that the PMA program had a carry-over of about $25,500,000. It was carried over by authorization of Congress

from year to year, because it had not been necessary to use the money to pay off the commitments. Section 1214, to which the Senator from Michigan referred, directed the President or the Bureau of the Budget—I believe it directed the President, and the President delegated the authority to the Bureau of the Budget—to impound $500,000,000 of the appropriations contained in the omnibus appropriation bill, which we finally succeeded in enacting in 1950.

The amount of $26,000,000 was taken out of the appropriations for soil conservation payments in the 1950 program, and the unobligated balances were brought in to take its place. The Department of Agriculture was directed to borrow whatever additional funds were needed to meet the commitments to the farmers.

As I understand the transaction, it was, more than anything else, a device for impounding unexpended balances, which made it necessary to borrow money from the Commodity Credit Corporation. Of course, the President did cut the fund by $26,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point I am making. The reason I opposed the Douglas amendment was that I did not want to be a party to compelling the Department of Agriculture to borrow money from the Commodity Credit Corporation to make up a deficit if the appropriation were too low this year. With that premise, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. Does the Senator from Georgia know exactly what the carry-over will be this year?

Mr. RUSSELL. No.

Mr. WHERRY. No one knows exactly what it will be.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not trying in any way to put the chairman of the subcommittee in a position where he must say that he is or is not opposed to the pending amendment. However, is it not correct to say that many observations were made, although perhaps there was not evidence adduced directly on that point, that the $275,000,000 appropriation might be adequate, if considered in connection with the amount of money which might be brought over from unobligated balances, unexpended balances, or money borrowed but not used.

Mr. RUSSELL. All the unexpended balances were cleaned out when the funds were impounded. I have tried to be perfectly frank with respect to this item. I stated before that no one knows exactly how much will have to be paid out, because when a ditch is dug, a dam is built, trees are planted, or tile drainage is laid, and the local committee of the county inspects the work, sometimes the work does not come up to the standards which have been set, and no payment is made. Sometimes a farmer indicates at the beginning of the year that he will carry out a conservation practice. Later he becomes so busy that he never gets around to doing it. There may be some reductions in the anticipated payments, of course. On the other hand, I see no reason for becoming excited about it. We had this carry-over of $26,000,000, which, through fiscal legerdemain, was impounded. I cannot say whether it will be necessary to borrow from the Commodity Credit Corporation if the Ferguson amendment is agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator from Georgia yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it correct to say that each year there has been an unobligated balance?

Mr. RUSSELL. There has always been a balance. Sometimes it has been as low as a million dollars.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. I wish to be absolutely fair about it. I want to pay the farmers what they contracted for. They should be paid what is owing to them. The proper way to pay the farmer is to appropriate the money, and then fight the borrowings by the agencies where they should be fought. On the other hand, I understood at the time of the committee hearing to which I have referred that if we were to appropriate $275,000,000 the committee felt—I may be wrong, because I see the distinguished Senator from Georgia shaking his head——

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Nebraska must be mistaken, because I could not know what he was referring to.

Mr. WHERRY. Perhaps the distinguished Senator was taking off his glasses. I certainly was under the impression that $275,000,000 would do the job, and that we had received assurances that $5,000,000, if needed, would come from the unexpended balance. I thought the committee was about to agree with that view. Opinion was closely divided. The chairman of the subcommittee knows that I want all contracts to be paid at the rate of 100 cents on the dollar, and I so voted. On the other hand, if funds are available to the extent of $5,000,000, and we can take a chance on it, I should like to see the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee accept the amendment. We could appropriate $275,000,000, and then see where we would come out.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a few minutes ago I stated that if we reduce this appropriation to $275,000,000, the reduction will not cost one farmer in the United States one dime. Such a reduction might mean that the Production and Marketing Administration would have to borrow the amount of the reduction from the Commodity Credit Corporation, in order to carry the agency over to the next year, and would have to pay interest on the amount that was borrowed.

No one can determine down to the last dollar what will be obligated, and I shall not undertake to do so. However, if the entire amount of the appropriation is not needed, the amount not needed will be carried over to the next year, in any event, and to that extent will reduce the amount of the appropriation required the next year. That is the situation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Do I correctly understand that the committee considered this matter and voted for the $280,000,000?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. We believed that the $280,000,000 figure would be the correct one, in order to avoid the necessity for this agency to borrow from the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "B" of the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment on page 31, in line 15.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings in connection with the quorum call be suspended, and that the order for the calling of the roll be vacated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "B" of the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment on page 31, in line 15.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, Mr. FERGUSON's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 31, in line 15.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, is an amendment on page 35 in order at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the question at this time is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 31, in line 15.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to inquire as to the result of the count on the division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Presiding Officer state what the count was on the division?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The count was 13 to 24.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 31, line 15.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the amendment on page 12, lines 22 to 23, inclusive, was passed over. I desire to call up that amendment, before we proceed to other committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Under the subhead "Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering," on page 12, line 22, after the word "airplanes", the committee proposes to strike out "$10,351,400" and insert "$10,589,730, including not to exceed $275,000 for the construction of a laboratory at Orlando, Fla."

Mr. RUSSELL. I move the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there is a great deal of confusion in the Senate, and it is very difficult to hear what is being said. As I understand, the Senator from Georgia is now asking for the adoption of the amendment on page 12, lines 22 to 24. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. I move the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia a question. As I understand from page 4 of the report, the Department of Agriculture is directed to spend $40,000 of this sum on an investigation of wheat mosaic. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. There can be no question on earth about it.

Mr. WHERRY. My reason for asking the question is that it is not included in the language on page 12, line 23.

Mr. RUSSELL. We never include such items in a bill. That item provides $40,000 for research on wheat mosaic. I may say that Representative HOPE, of Kansas, came before the committee and made what I thought was an overwhelming case in favor of this item, even though it is not included in the budget estimate. It was developed in the testimony that in the State of Kansas one county alone had sustained a loss of 1,800,000 bushels of wheat because of attacks by the green bug and the wheat mosaic. I felt it was the duty of the committee, despite the fact that there was no budget estimate, to recommend a modest appropriation so that an effort could be made to find a way to stop such a great economic loss to this country.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to say to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that I am in full accord with his action and that of other Senators in having placed a directive in the report; but there was a question I wanted answered: There are three items with respect to which the committee has directed the Secretary of Agirculture to act. One is the construction of a laboratory at Orlando, Fla. Another is for hybrid-onion research, at Parma, Idaho. The third is this item of $40,000 for research in connection with wheat mosaic. I am now merely seeking information. I notice the language is expressly set forth in the bill, on page 12, lines 22 to 24, inclusive, regarding the construction of a laboratory at Orlando, Fla., but the other two items are not in the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Nebraska will look at the item on page 12, line 22, he will find the figure of $10,589,730.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Embraced within that figure are perhaps 150 different research projects, not one of which is spelled out in the bill, but all of which appear in the budget estimates, except the two which we added, including the one for the hybrid-onion research at Parma, Idaho. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] came before the committee, and in my opinion made a very impressive case. I thought the appropriation was justified, and we included it. Our reason for mentioning the laboratory at Orlando was that we were required by law to do that, since it is a construction item.

Mr. WHERRY. I merely wanted the Senator to give an explanation, in order that those who are interested might know why it was included. To my way of thinking, the directive contained in the report is sufficient.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is sufficient for the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his explanation. I appreciate his industry.

Mr. RUSSELL. I can assure the Senator that, if we are able to save this item in the conference, the work which is contemplated will be done. To be perfectly frank, it is not a budgeted item.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that.

Mr. RUSSELL. But if research in the Department of Agriculture has any purpose, it ought to include research in connection with wheat mosaic, and also research respecting the greenbug which is attacking the wheat crops of Kansas and parts of Oklahoma, and is wreaking great devastation. I do not think the item ought to be opposed because there is not a budget estimate for it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have but one more question. If the $10,589,730 is approved by the Senate, there is no doubt, is there, that $40,000 will be spent for research on wheat mosaic?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, I could not say that, because I do not know what attitude the House may take toward this item.

Mr. WHERRY. I mean so far as the Senate is concerned.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, so far as the Senate is concerned, yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not worried about the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. If it is approved by the House, there is no doubt that $40,000 will be spent on wheat mosaic research. The greenbug is another item.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me ask a further question. If the amount of the amendment were reduced by $40,000, what would happen to the directive in that regard?

Mr. RUSSELL. It all depends upon what directive is given in the report of the conferees.

Mr. WHERRY. That is exactly what I am afraid of. I do not want to delay the Senate in a matter involving $40,000. I suppose I would be accused of being less economical if I did that than if I tried to write a directive.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is not opposed to this item, is he?

Mr. WHERRY. No, I am so much in favor of it, in fact, that I am trying to establish a legislative record, to the effect that it is understood that $40,000 will be spent for the purpose indicated. If the appropriation is cut, it is my opinion that that will be the first item to be rejected.

Mr. RUSSELL. Unless some other directive should be given in the conference report, that would certainly be the case, because it is an unbudgeted item.

Mr. WHERRY. That is exactly why I raised the question. I could offer an amendment, I suppose, on the floor of the Senate, directing that the money be spent according to the directive. I do not want to do that, because I realize there are a great many research items involved in the bill. Of course, if the amount is approved we need have no fear, so far as the Senate is concerned, but if it is reduced, I certainly hope the Department of Agriculture will realize that the item is so important that, somehow, that particular research should be conducted to the extent possible with $40,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have undertaken to discuss my views with respect to this matter. There can be no question, from the evidence submitted to the committee, that wheat mosaic and the green bug have gone on a rampage, ravaging the wheat in areas of Kansas and Oklahoma, and that the department should direct its efforts toward research. That was the thought when we supported this amendment very vigorously in committee. I am supporting it on the floor. I am proposing to urge its adoption as vigorously as I know how, when and if we get the bill into conference with the House.

Mr. CARLSON and Mr. BRIDGES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from Kansas, who has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Georgia and the committee for having made this recommendation regarding wheat mosaic and the green bug, which are diseases seriously affecting the winter-wheat area, not only in Kansas and Oklahoma, but in Colorado, Texas, and in certain parts of Nebraska. I think it most essential that the $40,000 be used for that purpose, and I sincerely hope that there will be no reduction in the committee amendment, because the ravages of these wheat pests have already cost us and have cost the

Nation millions and millions of bushels of wheat.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator, and I can reassure him that I shall do my very best.

Mr. LANGER and Mr. BRIDGES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have indicated to the Senator from New Hampshire that I would yield to him next.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Georgia that I personally favor this appropriation for the study of the mosaic disease in wheat. I think it is very worth while. Research has been carried on in regard to some items which are not so important as is wheat, which is the staff of life. For instance, I might mention tulips. Research is carried on to ascertain whether tulips can be forced to flower under artificial light. Experimental studies are being made to produce flowers by artificial light.

There are many items here which are perhaps not so essential as others in a country which is fighting a war, where the money is coming hard, and we are being strained in every line. So I am glad to have the Senator place emphasis on diseases of wheat, which is a very vital food crop. If economy is to be practiced by the Department, it might be tried on some of the activities which are not so essential to the life of this country, such as ascertaining whether tulips can be produced under artificial light. There is plenty of sunshine around the country without having to utilize artificial light.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from Texas referred to the greenbug in connection with winter wheat. I hope the chairman of the committee will make it clear to the Department of Agriculture that 2 years ago in the Middle West there was a very great loss of dark northern spring wheat because of the ravages of greenbug. The crop in whole areas was wiped out, leaving the land as bare as a floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 12, line 22.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement from the California Fruit Growers Exchange, located in Los Angeles, Calif., supporting the laboratory work in an effort to stamp out diseases of citrus fruits. It is being inserted in the RECORD at the request of the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who was the author of the amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF CALIFORNIA FRUIT GROWERS EXCHANGE, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

This statement is in support of an additional appropriation for facilities at Orlando, Fla., for research in citrus production, estimated to cost about $300,000. It is being submitted pursuant to authorization of the committee at its hearing held on July 11. At that time Senator HOLLAND appeared and presented a full statement in support of the proposed appropriation. He also requested opportunity for submission to the committee of this statement on behalf of the California Fruit Growers Exchange. The exchange was represented at the time, but was unable to complete the statement for submission on that date.

The California Fruit Growers Exchange markets citrus fruits grown in California and Arizona. Its members include about 20,000 growers, producing something over 70 percent of the total citrus fruits produced in those two States. California and Arizona produce practically all of the lemons grown in the United States for commercial distribution, about half of the oranges and a much smaller proportion of the grapefruit.

The presentation already made by Senator HOLLAND and the detailed statement filed by him on behalf of the Florida group cover the case so thoroughly that little need be added. The woeful inadequacy of present facilities, the importance of the work being done, its nature and extent and the propriety of the proposed expenditures are convincingly demonstrated.

The citrus growers of California and Arizona and the many persons in those States who are directly and indirectly interested in the citrus industry have a vital interest in the successful conduct of the research activities now under way and contemplated at the Orlando Sub-tropical Fruit Field Station of the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils and Engineering.

The Department of Agriculture has long recognized the necessity for replacement and improvement of the present inadequate facilities. The proposal was referred to in the report of the House Committee (Report No. 421) on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, at page 8. It was stated that the members of the committee are fully convinced of the need and are fully sympathetic with efforts to correct the conditions. While we fully agree with the prevailing sentiment that Federal expenditures must be reduced to the minimum, we believe that this project is of such exceptional and pressing immediate need, that an exception to the rule against additions to the budget should be made in this instance.

One of the most important studies being conducted by the Orlando station is that with reference to the disease known as Tristeza and the development of adequate resistance root stocks. This is a virus disease which has been particularly devastating in the orange orchards of South Africa and South America.

Another disease of a somewhat related character which has caused tremendous damage to the lemon groves of Sicily might also be mentioned. That disease is known as mal secco or wither tip—technically deuterophoma tracheiphila petri. While that disease has been met principally in the lemon-producing areas of Italy, it also attacks oranges and grapefruit. There is no known remedy for the disease and once it gets a foothold, complete destruction of trees appears to be the only control measure. Up to the present time, no occurrence has been observed in the North American Continent. But the threat of its spread to the citrus-producing areas of the United States is ever present.

A collection of five articles translated from the Italian and published by the United States Department of Agriculture give the latest information on this disease. The publication is dated July 28, 1950, and is issued as a Foreign Agricultural Circular (FCF-6-50) entitled "Mal Secco" translated by May Coult, with a foreword by J. Henry Burke. A copy of Mr. Burke's foreword is attached for further information on the subject.

The California Fruit Growers Exchange joins the Florida interests in urging approval of this badly needed project.

Respectfully submitted.

CALIFORNIA FRUIT GROWERS EXCHANGE,
PAUL S. ARMSTRONG, *General Manager.*

JULY 16, 1951.

FOREWORD

Our literature on the subject of Deuterophoma tracheiphila Petri is barren as to recent developments relating to this important citrus disease, and very little has been written in English since Dr. Fawcett made his studies nearly 20 years ago.

The material published here was collected during a study of the Italian citrus industry. Four of the articles were obtained from literature received during studies in Sicily in the late summer of 1949. It is hoped that these translations will help our citrus industry to a better understanding of an important citrus disease which has since 1918 reduced Italian lemon production by approximately 50 percent.

Mal secco is a tree-killing fungus disease. The danger lies in the manner in which it is spread through the air to healthy leaves and through the ground to the roots, and also in the fact that there is no known completely effective means of control.

From these translations you will see that no citrus variety is immune to this disease, only more or less resistant. Young sweet orange trees have been observed to be infected with this fungus in Italian nurseries. The degree of susceptibility to the disease depends upon the period of growth, and whether the fungus gains the upper hand during the periods of dormancy.

It will also be seen that infections of trees are more common in the areas where there is frequent frost damage since apparently the cold renders the resistant varieties temporarily susceptible to the disease. Lemon trees are also more susceptible in areas where wind damage is frequent.

Most important is the fact that, while different species have varying degrees of resistance to the disease, this applies only to infection through the leaves and branches. If infected dry leaves or branches are tilled into the soil, the fungus may enter the tree through a break or damage to the roots, and when this occurs no citrus variety is resistant to attack.

These facts lead to some interesting speculations. So far the disease has appeared only in citrus districts where hand tillage is practiced and great amounts of labor are expended on each acre. Since the disease may be spread by infected leaves dropping to the ground it might be possible that the disease would spread very rapidly in a citrus culture where tillage is by mechanical means and the infected leaves might be dragged through the orchard.

In Sicily, informed people in the citrus industry exhibited, in packing houses, lemon fruits said to be infected with this fungus. These fruits color more rapidly than noninfected fruits, and the button is shed since the fungus weakens the attachment of the fruit to the stem. In the button socket, immediately after the fruit is removed from the tree, there is a slight pink pigmentation. If the fruit is cut open, this pigmentation is observed to extend down through the core of the fruit and into the flesh at the blossom end.

If the fungus is in the fruit, it would be interesting to know whether an infected lemon, after being cut, juiced, and then dried as it might be in normal disposal after household use, would develop the fungus spores, under proper moisture and temperature conditions.

In the trantlations, the term "verdelli" is used many times and refers to a fruit. In Sicily the verdelli practice is the method

which is employed to produce summer lemons. Where this practice is followed, the lemon groves are allowed practically to dry out in June and July. In late July or early August irrigation water again is applied in two or three rapid irrigations with the addition of chemical fertilizer to shock the tree into an artificial bloom which produces lemons which ripen in summertime.

According to Sicilian terminology, the fruits of the lemon tree which ripen at the normal time in winter are referred to as lemons, and the fruits which are the result of the verdelli practice, or summer lemons are commonly referred to, not as lemons, but as verdelli.[1] The verdelli are therefore lemons which mature in the summer.

Thanks are due to the Experiment Station at Acireale for the publication, "Factors Which Govern or Contribute to the Development of Mal secco of Citrus Trees, and Methods of Combatting This Disease," and to the Citrus Chamber of Commerce at Messina for copies of its magazine Citrus. The assistance of the Messina Chamber of Commerce officials of the Italian Ministry of Agriculture and many citrus growers in Sicily also is acknowledged.

It is possible to present this collection of translated articles on mal secco due to the work of May Coult, translator for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, United States Department of Agriculture. Through her work as a translator of many technical articles, Miss Coult has become acquainted with plant pathology, and two of the articles presented here were selected by her as being pertinent to this subject and valuable to interested plant pathologists. This is therefore a more complete presentation of the subject due to her insight and thoughtfulness. It is a difficult subject to translate, and Miss Coult is to be congratulated for her excellent work.

Publication of this foreign agriculture circular is a phase of the study of foreign citrus producing areas, which is a part of the general program of developing foreign markets for United States agricultural products in plentiful supply and studying foreign competition with such products. This is presented separately due to the special nature of the subject. This work was carried out by the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations under provisions of the Research and Marketing Act and is presented in the interests of the United States citrus industry.

J. HENRY BURKE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, in lines 20 and 21, page 35, under the heading "Agricultural production programs," to strike out "$8,300,000" and insert "$12,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment "F."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 35, lines 20 and 21, it is proposed to strike out "$12,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, at first sight perhaps the members of the Appropriations Committee feel like congratulating themselves on the reduction which they have made in comparison with the appropriation for last year: Last year Congress appropriated for the Production and Marketing Administration, for administrative work, $29,900,000. The Senate committee is proposing $12,000,000. At first sight that seems to be a saving of $17,300,000, even though it is $3,700,000 more than the House figure of $8,300,000.

But, Mr. President, acreage controls have been abandoned as to the three great basic commodities of corn, wheat, and cotton. Last year the acreage allotments for corn were approximately 90,000,000 acres, 71,000,000 acres for wheat, and a little more than 28,000,000 acres for cotton, a total for those major crops of approximately 190,000,000 acres. There were also acreage restrictions on tobacco and peanuts amounting to about 7,000,000 acres. So, the total acreage allotments handled by the Production and Marketing Administration amounted to at least 197,000,000 acres, or just short of 200,000,000 acres.

For that work the Production and Marketing Administration received $30,000,000, in round figures, or approximately 15 cents an acre. But during last year, as we all know, the acreage restrictions on corn, wheat, and cotton have been abandoned, and the only restrictions remaining are on tobacco and peanuts, amounting to less than 7,000,000 acres. Yet the Bureau of the Budget presented a request for nearly $3 an acre. The estimate of the Senate committee provides them with administrative costs of approximately $1.80 an acre, or 16 times the per acre cost of last year.

In view of the fact that the Production and Marketing Administration work has shrunk from almost 200,000,000 to 7,000,000 acres, what justification, fundamentally, is there for a $12,000,000 appropriation?

The Production and Marketing Administration wanted $6,000,000 to publish and distribute a pamphlet, a copy of which I hold in my hand, entitled "1951 Production Guide," comprising 75 mimeographed pages of statistics and advice to the American farmer.

I have looked over the pamphlet with some interest. I would say it would be an excellent subject for a master's thesis in some department of agricultural economics; that it could be read with profit by graduate students in agricultural economics; that it may have some applicability, some interest for committees working under the Production and Marketing Administration; but certainly it never justified an original request for $6,000,000. I hold the copy in my hand, and I should like to have Senators inspect it.

As I recall the figures, there are approximately only 5,000,000 real farms in the United States. If we subtract the subsistence farms, which are not really in the commercial market, there are approximately 3,000,000 farms.

So the Department of Agriculture was originally asking that we furnish these copies to the farmers at an average cost of $1.20 per unit—5,000,000 copies. If we cut it down to 3,000,000 copies at $2 per unit, I believe the estimate of the committee is an allowance of $4,200,000 for this 1951 Production Guide, which, on the basis of 5,000,000 farms, would produce an 80-cent cost.

I am not an expert in printing costs. I believe the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], whom I see present, is an expert in such matters, as he is one of the large publishers of the country. I show the pamphlet to him and ask him informally if the cost would be 80 cents a unit. To my untutored mind it could be reproduced by mimeographing at from 15 to 20 cents a unit. If printed by the millions it could be done at a somewhat lower figure. I have given the Senator from Connecticut an opportunity to testify, and I should like to ask him if he thinks the cost would be 80 cents, or $1.20?

Mr. BENTON. This pamphlet, of course, is mimeographed. If it were printed by the millions I should think the unit cost would be a dime. The principal element of cost involved must be in the research underlying these tables.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That work has already been done in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BENTON. It is a compilation of the figures contained in the yearbooks of the Department of Agriculture. A good team could assemble that material in a month. I think it is accurate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very much interested in the statement of the Senator from Connecticut, who is the head of the Encyclopaedia Britannica in this country—although that is an American publication, I hasten to say—that this pamphlet could be reproduced for a dime. Yet the Department had the effrontery to propose a unit cost of $1.20; and the committee is recommending costs of 80 cents per unit.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. BENTON. I may suggest that very few publishers are experts on printing. We employ experts on printing. My curbstone opinion is most casual and superficial. But if the Senator is correct in his contention, may I ask him why he is proposing to reduce the sum merely from $12,000,000 to $10,000,000? Why not reduce the amount from $12,000,000 to $2,000,000?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be very glad to propose to reduce it by a greater amount than I have, but like Warren Hastings, when he testified before the British House of Commons and said that he was astonished at his own moderation, so I am astonished at the moderation with which I propose to make this cut. I am perfectly willing to cut the amount to the House figure. I think that is the best figure. But I notice that when it comes to a farm bill, no one wants to make a cut. So it seems to me that I should temper principle with discretion and propose a cut of only $2,000,000.

I may be wrong. I do not want to be unjust. But to my mind, this is the most bare-faced performance of raiding the Public Treasury in behalf of fake printing bills and in favor of an inflated organization I have seen for some time.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

[1] Verdell is the singular form of verdelli.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I feel I should say a few words about the amendment. Of course, if this matter were exactly as pictured by the Senator from Illinois, in his total misconception of it, the Secretary of Agriculture should have been discharged for ever requesting such a budget estimate, and the President should have been roundly condemned for having approved it and having sent it to the Congress, and the budget officer should have been discharged. The Senator from Illinois is correct in saying that we reversed the program completely. We had marketing quotas on cotton, we had acreage allotments on wheat and corn. Many millions of acres were involved. We had an appropriation of some $25,000,000 to handle that program. The idea of Korea completely reversed the farm program. Instead of having acreage allotments and marketing quotas we had to go completely in the other direction. Instead of reducing production, the great need was for increased production, and the farmers were requested to increase production by 48 percent in order that there might be available the commodities necessary to enable us to pass through this critical period.

Furthermore, Mr. President, such times require the production of a number of specialty crops. We have to produce the things wherein we are not self-sufficient. The scorned pamphlet to which the Senator from Illinois referred, which may have cost too much for all I know, but it is an important pamphlet, was designed to advise the farmers of crops of which we are deficient in this country in order that they might know what was necessary to produce to take care of defense needs. This item is some five or six million dollars below the budget estimate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will my good friend yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is below the original budget estimate, yes; but is it not true that when the House cut the figures the Bureau of the Budget discovered that the Production and Marketing Administration could operate on less money than the $20,000,000 originally asked for, so that the Senate committee figure is $2,000,000 below the $14,000,000 figure which the budget finally said they could operate with, after the House had pushed them quite severely?

Mr. RUSSELL. The original estimate was $20,000,000, and the revised estimate was $14,000,000. The action of the House had something to do with it; and, of course, the Department realized that there was going to be quite a delay before the appropriation bill could be passed, and that they could not spend all the money. One-twelfth of the year has already elapsed, and perhaps by the time the bill is passed, one-sixth of the year will have elapsed. Therefore, they may not be able to carry on the program for the full year at all.

Mr. President, there may be too much money in this item. I have no way of knowing exactly down to the last dollar what the amount should be. I thought we were very conservative when we cut the amount below the revised estimates based on a revised appraisal of the situation, including the fact that the fiscal year started on the 1st of July. But this I do know, Mr. President, that when we had a so-called War Food Administration in World War II, which had levels of production that were 10 or 12 percent below the levels we have fixed for 1952, we spent $30,000,000 or $40,000,000, and I think as high as $80,000,000 in one year on the War Food Administration. No one thought anything about it.

Now, either the Nation is endangered and should have defense production or defense production is not needed. If it is needed, I think the item recommended by the committee is conservative, because it is about one-half of what we were spending when we had actually the control programs to which the Senator alludes. But I believe it is important to have some agency or activity of the Government in Washington which is familiar with the needs, which can obtain advance notice of the Nation's requirements and can pass that information through the county committees to the individual farmer in order that he may produce to meet the needs.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Is it not a fact that all the price-support programs are under PMA, and that therefore this money will be used to carry on those programs?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. The Senator from North Dakota is a farmer and has more familiarity with the subject than any other Member of the Senate.

Mr. YOUNG. In the past 3 months the prices of most basic commodities have dropped quite severely, and most of them now are below support levels—about 80 or 85 percent of parity or lower.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. I think the item is justified. That is my opinion about it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, of course, one feels very reluctant to challenge the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, whose knowledge of these matters is very great, and whose public spirit is real. I should like to point out that the $12,000,000 appropriation allows $5,800,000 for acreage allotments and marketing quotas, the precise amount of the final figure of the budget. It allows $2,000,000 for assistance to farmers in obtaining necessary facilities for production, and it allows $4,200,000 for the production guides, or an average cost of production and distribution of 80 cents per unit to the 5,000,000 farmers.

My proposal to cut the amount by $2,000,000 is a very modest one. There will still be $5,800,000 for acreage allotments. Incidentally, that would be a cost per acre of approximately 80 cents, because the acreage allotments now apply only to peanuts and tobacco. That is an 80-cent-per-acre figure, whereas we were operating on a 15-cent-per-acre figure. It still allows $2,000,000 for production facilities, and it allows $2,200,000 for the production guides at 40 cents apiece.

All I am saying is, let us save $2,000,000 on production guides. Instead of their costing $4,200,000, let them cost $2,200,000. Is not $2,200,000 enough? Or are the gentlemen in the Department of Agriculture so interested in padding printing costs and in finding an excuse for their organization in distributing this material, that they want to bill us at 80 cents a copy?

Mr. President, millions of dollars are being asked merely for this little publication. I submit that here is a chance where we can save a couple of million dollars.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hennings	Millikin
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Bennett	Hill	Moody
Benton	Hoey	Morse
Bricker	Holland	Mundt
Bridges	Hunt	Neely
Butler, Md.	Ives	Nixon
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chavez	Kem	Russell
Clements	Kerr	Saltonstall
Connally	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Cordon	Knowland	Smathers
Dirksen	Langer	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Lodge	Smith, N. C.
Eastland	Magnuson	Sparkman
Ecton	Malone	Stennis
Ellender	Martin	Taft
Ferguson	Maybank	Underwood
Frear	McCarran	Watkins
Gillette	McCarthy	Wherry
Green	McClellan	Wiley
Hayden	McFarland	Williams
Hendrickson	McKellar	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment on page 35, beginning in line 20.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Presiding Officer be kind enough to state the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 35, line 20, after the word "commodities" Mr. DOUGLAS proposes to strike out "$12,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the chief clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from

Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], if present and voting, would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is detained on official business.

On this vote the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea" and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—48

Bennett	Hennings	Moody
Benton	Hickenlooper	Nixon
Bricker	Hoey	O'Conor
Bridges	Hunt	Pastore
Butler, Md.	Ives	Robertson
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kem	Schoeppel
Carlson	Kilgore	Smathers
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Lodge	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Malone	Taft
Ecton	Martin	Watkins
Ferguson	McCarthy	Wherry
Frear	Millikin	Wiley
Hendrickson	Monroney	Williams

NAYS—30

Aiken	Hill	McFarland
Anderson	Holland	McKellar
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Mundt
Connally	Kerr	Neely
Eastland	Langer	Russell
Ellender	Magnuson	Sparkman
Gillette	Maybank	Stennis
Green	McCarran	Underwood
Hayden	McClellan	Young

NOT VOTING—18

Brewster	Case	Fulbright
Butler, Nebr.	Duff	George
Cain	Flanders	Humphrey
Jenner	McMahon	Thye
Kefauver	Murray	Tobey
Long	O'Mahoney	Welker

So Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments on page 35, line 20, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was on page 35, line 21, after the word "than", to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$2,800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National school lunch program", on page 36, line 11, after "(42 U. S. C. 1751–1760)", to strike out $83,500,000" and insert "$83,367,419."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Marketing services", on page 38, line 6, after the word "*Provided*", to strike out:

> That hereafter appropriations available for classing or grading any agricultural commodity without charge to the producers thereof maybe reimbursed from nonadministrative funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the cost of classing or grading any such commodity for producers who are eligible to obtain Commodity Credit Corporation price support.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

> That hereafter there may be transferred to appropriations available for classing or grading any agricultural commodity without charge to the producers thereof such sums from nonadministrative funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation as may be necessary in addition to other funds available for these purposes, such transfers to be reimbursed from subsequent appropriations therefor.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Commodity Exchange Authority," on page 38, line 22, after "(7 U. S. C. 1-17a)", to strike out "$650,000" and insert "$591,072."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Crop Insurance Corporation", on page 38, line 24, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$8,000,000" and insert "$7,949,911."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, to this committee amendment, I offer the amendment which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 38, in line 25, it is proposed to strike out "$7,949,911" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,904,570."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this committee amendment relates to the item for crop insurance. Instead of allowing the amount of the committee amendment, my amendment to the committee amendment would reduce the appropriation to the amount the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation had for administrative expenses for the fiscal year 1950.

Mr. President, over the years I have followed this matter closely, and I should like now to take a little time to refresh the memory of the Members of the Senate in regard to the history of crop insurance.

This entire program was authorized away back in 1938. I remember very well indeed when it was authorized, and I also remember my own objection to it, even at that time.

The crop-insurance program continued until 1943, and then got into difficulties, and was suspended. It was reinstated in 1945.

In 1947 Congress revised the program, and replaced it on a limited and experimental basis.

Under the law under which the revised program was developed, a sound system and adequate premiums were called for.

I think the Senate will be interested in the financial history of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, which I have followed very closely.

In the first years, when it was going full blast as a program applicable to the entire country, for all commodities, the Corporation lost $76,825,000. That was the net amount of the indemnities over and above premiums. However, that does not tell the entire story, because in those years this agency had in excess of $42,000,000, as I recall—I have not refreshed my memory recently on the figure, but it was at least $40,000 or $42,000,000—for administrative expenses.

What happened was that the entire capital stock of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation was simply exhausted. At that time I took the position that either the program of this agency should be cut back or the agency should be supended entirely.

Now of course some improvement has been made. On a limited basis, Federal crop insurance applies to only 877 counties in the entire country, and applies to six or seven commodities, and is applicable to approximately 40 States.

The evidence taken at the hearings and the records submitted indicate that in the 3 years 1948, 1949, and 1950, the premiums were approximately $38,000,000 and the indemnities were approximately $34,000,000. So it is rather interesting to note from the testimony that the premiums exceeded the indemnities by approximately $4,000,000. However, that does not tell the whole story, because this agency was operating during those 3 years with approximately $13,000,000 out of the Federal Treasury.

So if we are really going to draw up an honest-to-goodness balance sheet and if we are going to include the cost of doing business, we find that the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, instead of having made money or instead of having had an excess of income over expenditures, actually lost $9,000,000 during those 3 years; and the expenditures were approx-

imately 33 percent of all the premium income.

As has been indicated, this agency has approximately 465 full-time employees and 540 part-time employees, and its officials estimate that it will have something in excess of 1,000 employees of all kinds for the fiscal year 1952.

I emphasize to the Senate that this corporation has been doing business, off and on, on either a full or a limited basis, for 13 years. I am not a bit satisfied with its balance sheet, and I think that even on a limited or experimental basis, this corporation is not now showing any better results than it has shown in the past.

It is rather interesting to note that there is actual resistance to crop insurance. This agency has not been able to demonstrate its usefulness to such an extent as to develop any enthusiasm on the part of the farmers for its program. If the corporation had been able to do so, it would not now be asking, for the next fiscal year, for half a million dollars in order to be able to inaugurate a high-pressure selling campaign.

There is a reason for that situation, Mr. President. In the Corporation's own statement by way of justification, the officials of the Corporation state—as we find on page 673 of the House hearings, which are infinitely more amplified than are the hearings before the Senate Appropriations Committee:

> Even though the Corporation is selling continuous-type contracts, approximately 25 percent have been canceled each year either by the farmer or by the Corporation because of nonpayment of premiums or failure to conform to prescribed farming practices. The 1950 crop year cancellation rate of 1949 continuous contracts by commodity is as follows:

Commodity: [1]	*Cancellation rate*
Wheat	12
Cotton	47
Flax	20
Corn	18
Tobacco	31

[1] Continuous contracts for beans and multiple crop were first sold in crop year 1950.

So, Mr. President, we can understand why the Corporation needs half a million dollars or more in order to put on a high pressure selling drive.

The officials of the Corporation state the case very plainly when they say:

> This means that of the 434,300 contracts in force in 1951, approximately 117,400 will be canceled and will be replaced by new policyholders.

Mr. President, it is all very well to say that the Corporation has to sustain some kind of a sound level of operations on a sound actuarial basis. However, frankly speaking, when this Corporation has to put on a selling drive in order to sell the insurance to the farmers, and when the Corporation is up against the kind of a cancellation rate it has actually experienced, it seems to me we are justified in being very suspicious of the justification for this program and in believing that its operations are on a bad basis, and that if we were to appropriate further funds for this purpose, we would be throwing good money after bad.

If the premiums the farmers are paying are not commensurate with the cost of doing this business—and certainly the premiums are not in keeping with the amount of indemnities which are being paid—the arrangement is not a sound one.

In this connection, Mr. President, let me point out that the total obligations of this Corporation appropriation are increasing. The total obligations in 1950 were $4,904,570; the 1951 estimate is $7,095,625; and the 1952 estimate is $8,200,000.

Frankly, I want to see a little more return for the money. I want to see better progress made, in view of the expenditures—because, after all, all the taxpayers of the United States have to sustain this administrative cost—before I care to venture any increased expenditures in behalf of this Corporation.

So, Mr. President, the amendment I propose to the committee amendment woud reduce the administrative expenses of this Corporation to the 1950 level. My amendment to the committee amendment would give the Corporation some money with which to proceed with actuarial experiments, and so forth; and if in future years the Corporation demonstrates that it has done better, and is able to present a better balance sheet than the one presented to us now, I shall be willing to modify my views on this matter.

I had hoped that there would be an improvement, and that the farmers would rush in to join in this program. After all, when there are so many county committeemen scattered all over the States, and when this program in the Department of Agriculture embraces 68,000 full-time and part-time employees, most of whom are in the field and have contact with the farmers, if by word of mouth and expressions of good will they cannot get the farmers to join in this program any more than they have joined in it up to the present time, I think the time has come for the Congress to cut back the program.

So my amendment to the committee amendment would restore the amount of the appropriation for administrative expenses to the amount allowed in 1950. I think the testimony of the officials of the corporation themselves justifies making the cut which I propose. As a matter of fact, I think I have exercised a great deal of charity and restraint in not proposing to reduce the amount of the appropriaiton more than I do by means of the amendment which I have submitted to the committee amendment.

So, Mr. President, I trust that this rather interesting venture in the entire field of crop insurance will be kept at a reasonable level before we move out too far and fritter away more of the taxpayers' money.

Let me remind the Senate that it will not be too long before there will be a tax bill before us. Perhaps it will be before us in several months. No one knows at the moment what additional taxes will be required, whether $5,000,000,000, $6,000,000,000, $7,000,000,000, or more; but we have no moral right to sweat that kind of money out of the pocketbooks of the taxpayers unless we can justify the expenditures authorized by Congress—and in that connection I refer not only to billions of dollars, but also to millions of dollars, and also to hundreds of thousands of dollars, as well.

I confess, Mr. President, that I shall find it very difficult indeed to vote for the tax bill, when it comes before the Senate, because I have not been too deeply impressed with what the Congress up to this good hour has done in the field of economy. It is so easy to let the other fellow do it, or to expect the other agency to bear the burden. I have said on occasion that, in times such as these, I think of the little girl whose father gave her 10 cents for an ice-cream cone. While she was proceeding to the drug store to buy the cone, a kind lady encountered her and said, "Where are you going?" She replied, "I am going to the drug store to buy a cone. My father gave me a dime." The good lady said, "Well, why don't you give the dime to a missionary in China?" She replied, "I am going to get a cone, and I will let the druggist give the dime to the missionary in China."

Pass it off, if you please, but believe me, there will be a day of reckoning with respect to these appropriations, and I think, in all conscience and fairness, I should now make known to the Senate that, if a sufficient number of Senators will join me, when the deliberations on the bill are concluded, I intend to ask for a yea-and-nay vote on its passage. I feel deeply about the fiscal integrity and the solvency of the United States. We should not fail to protect both; and here is an opportunity to cut back a few millions of dollars, because, by the administration's own record, they certainly have not justified this increase.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. I wonder whether the Senator from Illinois has ever heard the story of the man who endeavored to get his cow to eat sawdust by putting green glasses on her eyes. It was a very successful experiment, except that the cow died.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sure that if it was a homeopathic remedy, I may say to my friend from West Virginia, it must have been eminently successful. Possibly we ought to apply a homeopathic remedy, or doses of such remedies, to this appropriation bill. We might succeed in cutting back some of the expenditures.

Mr. KILGORE. I should also like to ask the Senator whether he realizes that in Germany, during World War II—and I am giving the Senator a basic fact—the German Government conceived the idea, similar to the invention of the man who put green glasses on his cow to make her eat sawdust, of using sawdust to develop a species of sugar from wood. It was not a true sugar, in the sense of being sweet. They also developed from sawdust a mold that could be used for cow feed, so that eventually, in World War II, the Germans fed their cows upon sawdust. However, I may say to the

Senator from Illinois that it required governmental intervention and governmental capitalization to force a man, instead of going to the five-and-ten-cent store to buy a pair of green glasses, to buy a cow feed developed from sawdust by governmental experimentation and appropriation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I conclude by saying that I hope this amendment will appeal to the Members of the Senate being directed to a proper place for economy.

Mr. KILGORE Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. My time has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is correct about the very trying experience we had with the old Crop Insurance Corporation. He is, however, undertaking to charge up to the new the sins of the old; which is the same as charging the sins of the son to the father. There is room for debate as to whether the Government should ever have embarked on the crop insurance program. The insurance companies who sell hail insurance and wind insurance are very bitterly opposed to this program, because damages by hail and by wind are likewise included in the policies which are sold to the farmer.

It so happens that there is not an insurance company anywhere on earth which deals in this type of insurance. Some people thought that the farmer was entitled to have some insurance against the hazards which beset agriculture, and considered whether he should have insurance against droughts, against floods, and against the other hazards which periodically cause great losses to farmers. There is no great private company on earth from which such protection can be obtained.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Did the crop insurance cover damage by floods?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course it covered damage to crops by floods; and under this very program thousands of dollars will be paid to the farmers in the area which is now under water.

Mr. President, following the original venture, we overhauled the program entirely. We put it on an experimental basis, with selected counties to be covered, and selected commodities to be insured.

The Senator refers to the increase in the administrative expense. I point out that the Congress directed how this program should increase. In the year 1950, which the Senator used as a base, there were 394 counties in the program. Under the law enacted by the Congress, there will be 877 counties in the program in the year 1952. The Department can not possibly carry on this program as it is now in the process of development, even on an actuarial basis, under the appropriations suggested by the Senator from Illinois. If it is desired to do away with the program, let us simply eliminate the entire appropriation. This Congress, I think, is possibly in a temper to kill anything of this nature, so it would perhaps be better to eliminate all of this appropriation, rather than hamstring the program and waste $4,000,000 in the process, as would be done in the event the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois should be adopted.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe the Senator referred to this, but is it not true that Congress enacted a law a short time ago requiring the Crop Insurance Corporation to increase its operations, and to extend them to a number of additional counties?

Mr. RUSSELL. That act was approved August 25, 1949. That is what I am referring to. Congress directed the Corporation to apply the program to new crops and to an increasing number of counties.

Mr. ANDERSON. If this amendment should be adopted, would it not be well to repeal the law which requires the Department to carry on this program?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly that should be done; or, if we simply want to use a meat ax, we should eliminate the entire appropriation, and tell the farmer that he is going to be thrown back to where he was, and that he cannot possibly get any insurance for his crops anywhere on earth. That is the position in which it would leave him.

Mr. LANGER. Not even Lloyds of London would write such insurance.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the one form of insurance that cannot be obtained anywhere on earth.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree to all that has been said about the losses which occurred heretofore in the crop-insurance program. The losses in connection with the original program, as the Senator from Illinois will remember, were partly because of the fact that the program seemed to be regarded as additional compensation to farmers, not as an insurance program. When it was placed upon an insurance basis, and an effort was made to set up actuarial tables in the very first year in which the new program was in operation there resulted an operating profit of something like 45 percent. That cannot continue forever.

There are bad years with insurance companies of all forms. We have seen the largest and best-managed insurance casualty companies in this country come to the Government for relief when they were practically bankrupt. This Crop Insurance Corporation had a bad year in 1949. It did not have an extremely good year in 1950—only a fairly good year—but, again, they were taking in new territory, by direction of the Congress of the United States. Since the Congress ordered the Crop Insurance Corporation to expand its program, and ordered it to go into new territories, I do not believe it is then proper for the Congress to say it should not have expanded.

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree completely with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Illinois will indulge me a moment, I desire to point out that the great difference between the new program and the original program is that under the original program, the Government Corporation endeavored to insure the full value of the farmer's crop. Under the new program, all that the farmer can insure is the cost of planting his crop and getting it in the ground. So far as all his labor in it is concerned, he can get no insurance at all; he can only insure the actual out-of-pocket cost of planting the crop.

I believe, Mr. President, this is a proper function of the Federal Government. Certainly, if the Congress has changed its mind and wishes to do away with the crop-insurance program, it should eliminate the appropriation entirely, and not put it on such a basis that it cannot possibly hope to function.

Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. AIKEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois, after which I shall yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am interested in getting all the facts before the Senate, before it passes judgment. My friend from Georgia will agree, first of all, that the Government had a loss of nearly $73,000,000 on the first 7 years' operation of this program, will he not?

Mr. RUSSELL. I thought it was more than that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That figure excludes certain items of loss.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thought it was very unfair for the Senator from Illinois to charge up to this program the expenses of the old one, because he knows, better than almost anyone else, that this is an entirely different program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand.

Mr. RUSSELL. And it is a much more conservative program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But let us take it step by step. If we add the administrative expenses, the cost was well over $100,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. That was the figure I had in mind. But that has nothing to do with the present program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand. At the end of 7 years I made an effort to liquidate the Corporation, and there was the same identical argument from members of the Committee on Agriculture and other committees. But, as a result, it was actually liquidated in an appropriation bill, as my friend from Georgia will remember, and then it was restored on an experimental basis.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Corporation should have modified their actuarial basis. They have been in process of doing it, and they have had some years of experience in the program. But where are we? When we take the $13,000,000 of administrative expenses and measure it against losses, we are still, as the saying is, "behind the 8-ball."

Mr. RUSSELL. I regret that I cannot yield for an argument. The Senator has consistently opposed the program, and he succeeding in liquidating it. The Senator was correct when he said the Government was paying the overhead costs of the insurance. If the Government did not do it, there would be no insurance companies that could do it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I know something about the crop insurance program, because the new program is the product of what the present occupant of the White House chooses to call the worst Congress in history."

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is agreeing with the President, at least so far as crop insurance is concerned.

Mr. AIKEN. As the Senator from Georgia says, the program was about to be abandoned. Approximately $100,000,000 had been lost because of the fact that the Government guaranteed the full income from the crop. The program was abused. So the question arose as to whether we should revise the program and put it on a sounder experimental basis, or abandon it altogether.

The Eightieth Congress approved a bill which was sponsored by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] and myself. It was a bipartisan measure, and was approved in the Senate without any serious opposition. It limited the number of counties which could be insured. We tried to get the insurance companies interested in it. As I recall, the bill itself authorized the Federal Government to work through private insurance companies so far as possible, but except for writing hail insurance, they were not interested in crop insurance at all, and were hardly interested in hail insurance. They had to charge such a high rate that I do not think the companies themselves liked it. But the program worked out, and most of the crops insured finished in the black or broke even. It was used largely by tobacco growers and wheat growers.

The Eighty-first Congress, which is supposed to be the next worst in history until the Eighty-second is appraised, amended the bill so as to provide for extending the activities. Am I correct in assuming that the increase in the appropriation which is provided is to take care of the increased coverage in counties authorized by the Eighty-first Congress?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, not quite. As against this year, yes; but there will be the same number of counties next year as there are at the present time.

Mr. RUSSELL. The budget estimate shows 394 counties for 1950, 624 for 1951, and 877 for 1952. That indicates the increase which has taken place in the applications for crop insurance.

Mr. AIKEN. As I recall, the bill which passed the Eightieth Congress provided that each year additional crops might be brought under coverage in an experimental manner.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Having had a life of 4 or 5 years, the activity is still in an experimental stage. Congress hoped, and I think the farmers hoped, that there would eventually be worked out some kind of crop insurance which would be workable for the entire country. I consider it still on an experimental basis. I do not know exactly how much money is needed, whether the Department has asked for too much, or whether the committee has allowed too much.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I dislike to take the time of the Senate, but I desire to make it clear that the program is still experimental and is still widening. It is to be applied for the first time this year in the Florida citrus industry. Polk County, the home county of the Senator from Florida, is where the first trial program has been set up, only this year. There has been great need for reasonable insurance coverage, and I think it is a highly worth-while effort, which will show the way to mutual or other commercial operations in the future. The Federal Government is not expected to carry anything but a minor part of the administrative cost, and I thoroughly approve of the venture, which does not invade any field which has been covered in recent years by private commercial insurance companies. It should establish its value or lack of value in this first experiment this year. The Florida citrus industry is an industry of approximately $200,000,000 a year, and it is worth while to bring insurance protection into that field.

Mr. RUSSELL. And the growers will be called upon to pay the taxes to which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] adverted.

Mr. HOLLAND. They have been called upon to pay, through taxes, the cost of similar programs in other industries. They have not murmured about that. Now they have their first opportunity to participate in the program.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to make one observation, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. I insist that if we are to cripple the program, the wisest thing to do would be to eliminate the entire appropriation. The bill of which the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] was coauthor contains a clause which authorizes and directs that the program be turned over to private companies any time they are willing to undertake it. For my part, I am willing to welcome and embrace any private company that has any capital at all which is willing to come forward and take the program off the hands of the Federal Government.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. It was the purpose of the program to develop a method by which crop insurance would be taken over by private insurance companies, but none of them was willing or anxious to take over the experimental phases of the program. In fact, they probably could not afford to do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. They can reinsure any part of the business.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I frankly say to the Senator from Georgia that the loss has occurred for 13 years, and if 13 years of loss is not enough, then what will it take to get the Government out of the business?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it is still unfair to charge up to the new effort the losses of the old Crop Insurance Corporation. I do not think it is at all fair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would not the Senator from Georgia agree that while this program is a very good one, that the administrative cost should be paid by the people who take out the insurance?

Mr. RUSSELL. No.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What the Senator from Georgia and his committee have proposed is that at least 75 percent of the administrative costs shall be borne by the Government.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Georgia is not proposing such a thing at all. That is the provision of the basic act under which the Crop Insurance Corporation proceeds. The Senator from Georgia is making no such proposal. We have appropriated pursuant to the law. Of course, if the costs are going to be charged up to the farmers, only the private companies would be in business.

Mr. AIKEN. This was, frankly, an experimental program, and charging the costs up to the farmer would be the same as charging the cost of the development of new varieties of wheat or new methods of pest controls to the ultimate user.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hennings	Monroney
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Moody
Bennett	Hill	Morse
Benton	Hoey	Mundt
Brewster	Holland	Neely
Bricker	Hunt	Nixon
Bridges	Ives	O'Conor
Butler, Md.	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Carlson	Kem	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kerr	Schoeppel
Clements	Kilgore	Smathers
Connally	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Lodge	Sparkman
Dworshak	Magnuson	Stennis
Eastland	Malone	Taft
Ecton	Martin	Underwood
Ferguson	Maybank	Watkins
Frear	McCarthy	Wherry
Gillette	McClellan	Wiley
Green	McFarland	Williams
Hayden	McKellar	Young
Hendrickson	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to the committee amendment on page 38, line 25.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

On this vote the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—33

Bennett	Frear	Nixon
Brewster	Hendrickson	O'Conor
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Bridges	Hoey	Saltonstall
Butler, Md.	Ives	Smith, Maine
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Kem	Smith, N. C.
Dirksen	Knowland	Taft
Douglas	Lodge	Watkins
Dworshak	Martin	Wherry
Ferguson	Moody	Williams

NAYS—44

Aiken	Holland	Millikin
Anderson	Hunt	Monroney
Benton	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Mundt
Chavez	Kerr	Neely
Clements	Kilgore	Pastore
Connally	Langer	Russell
Cordon	Lehman	Schoeppel
Eastland	Magnuson	Smathers
Ecton	Malone	Sparkman
Gillette	Maybank	Stennis
Green	McCarthy	Underwood
Hayden	McClellan	Wiley
Hennings	McFarland	Young
Hill	McKellar	

NOT VOTING—19

Butler, Nebr.	George	Murray
Cain	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Case	Jenner	Thye
Duff	Kefauver	Tobey
Ellender	Long	Welker
Flanders	McCarran	
Fulbright	McMahon	

So Mr. DIRKSEN's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 38, line 24.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Loan authorizations", on page 39, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "a total of $100,000,000" and insert "$75,000,000", and in line 13, after the word "program", to insert "and $25,000,000 for the rural telephone program."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Farmers' Home Administration—Loan authorization", on page 41, line 12, after the word "amended", to strike out "$100,000,000" and insert "$110,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. I call up my amendment identified as 7-25-51—D.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 41, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "$110,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$103,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we are not making much progress in cutting the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. The only cut which we have made is a reduction of $2,000,000, which I had the honor of proposing, from $4,200,000 to $2,200,00, for the cost of printing and distributing the magnificent pamphlet entitled "Production Guides," which I display to the Senate.

After the amendment was adopted a number of Senators were kind enough to shake my hand and congratulate me on the reduction. I told them that I was very appreciative of their congratulations, but I urged them not to be too sure about the reduction. I should like to make a prediction. It is that along about next winter the Department of Agriculture will come to Congress for a deficiency appropriation. It will ask for $2,000,000 to print and distribute this handsome pamphlet to the American farmers.

I believe there is developing—and I heard rumors in the cloak room to the effect that the Department of Agriculture intends to bring forth a deficiency appropriation request—a tendency on the part of administrative agencies to take the appropriating function out of the hands of Congress. If any of their appropriations are cut they serve notice, either openly or tacitly, that they will come back to Congress and get the money on a deficiency appropriation when the guard in the House and Senate is down.

I am serving notice on the Department of Agriculture that if such is their intention we shall be watching the proposed deficiency appropriation very carefully in the Senate. Let them beware about trying to get the $2,000,000 restored in a deficiency appropriation.

That is all I have to say with respect to the past item. I now wish to speak briefly on the pending amendment.

First of all, I wish to say that I believe the Farmers Home Administration is one of the finest accomplishments of the Democratic Party and of the Roosevelt administration. It is designed to help the man farthest down. I believe it to be a splendid program, and it should be continued. I would fight to the death any attempt to cripple it.

However, I should like to point out that last year $103,000,000 was spent for the program. The House committee recommended that the amount be cut to $100,000,000, or by 3 percent. The House of Representatives approved the reduction to $100,000,000. The Senate committee has increased the amount to $110,000,000, representing an increase of $7,000,000 over the amount expended last year, without too much explanation as to why the increase is recommended.

My amendment would retain for the coming year the same amount which was appropriated last year. My amendment is not a proposal to cut the funds of the program below the amounts used last year. It is merely a proposal to prevent the program from costing more during a period when we are faced with national defense costs of about $50,000,000,000.

I shall say no more.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I rise to speak briefly in view of the inference that the committee increased the appropriation wildly, recklessly, and without any sense or reason. There was reason for increasing the appropriation.

First of all, I wish to point out that we are dealing with a loan fund, and that the funds are repaid to the Treasury. The loans are made to a class of farmers who must have certification to the fact that they cannot obtain funds anywhere else. The repayments on principal amounts are running considerably more than 99 percent. If we include interest payments, which are made at a higher rate than the Government pays, it will be seen that the funds are paid off to an extent greater than the Government is out of pocket because of them.

That is the first part of my statement.

In the second place, the Bureau of the Budget recommended an increase in the loan fund to $110,000,000. They did it for two reasons. First, because of increased farming costs, fewer farmers can be assisted now than a year ago with the same amount of loan funds. The average size of initial adjustment loans has increased from $1,189 in 1949 to $1,360 in 1950, and for the current fiscal year it will average approximately $1,750. That is why even with the increased item, not so many farmers will be serviced.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield, but I am able to yield only very briefly.

Mr. STENNIS. I shall be brief. In other words, it will cost more to make a crop than it cost before. Is not that the entire situation?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. Even with the increased appropriation, the agency will not be able to reach the same number of farmers.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Is not this agency the only one which extends to farmers credit to enable them to get started in the farming business?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is exactly the point.

Mr. YOUNG. This agency has done a remarkable job, let me say.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; it has.

Mr. President, by means of other programs we give all kinds of assistance to farmers, including assistance to enable them to obtain training and to build homes. However, we overlook the appropriation of any money whatever to enable a veteran to borrow operating funds in order to establish himself in the farming business. This item is the only one by means of which the veteran is able to obtain from the Federal Government funds with which to establish himself in the farming business.

There will be more applications from veterans, many of whom have received on-the-farm training at the expense of the Federal Government, than this fund will be able to accommodate.

This item is not costing the Government any money because it represents a loan which is repaid. However, if we strike out this item, we shall be denying operating funds to more than 7,000 farmers throughout the United States, and that at a time when we are requesting more farm production than we have ever had before. If we eliminate this item, we shall force 7,000 farmers out of business, although it is not costing the Government anything to carry on this loan program at the present time.

So, Mr. President, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinos [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment on page 41, in line 12.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 41, in line 12.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 41, in line 13, after the word "amended", to strike out "$4,250,000" and insert "$5,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses", on page 42, line 21, after the numerals "1950", to strike out "$27,500,000" and insert "$28,150,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Farm Credit Administration," on page 43, line 7, after "(12 U. S. C. 833)", to strike out "$300,000" and insert "$400,000", and in line 12, after the word "agencies", to strike out "$2,625,000" and insert "$2,725,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Extension Service—Salaries and expenses", on page 44, line 25, after the word "possessions", to strike out "$880,000" and insert "$818,673."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Secretary", on page 45, line 11, after the word "Agriculture", to strike out "$2,082,200" and insert "$1,992,168."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations," on page 46, line 18, after the word "only", to strike out "$600,000" and insert "$548,054."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Information," on page 46, line 25, after the word "Department", to strike out "$1,271,000" and insert "$1,215,268."

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, to this committee amendment I call up my amendment lettered "H."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from California to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 47, line 1, in lieu of "$1,215,268," it is proposed to insert "$878,268."

On page 47, line 16, beginning with the word "and", strike out all down to and including "$611,128" in line 21, and insert in lieu thereof ", $286,128."

On page 48, line 11, before the period insert a colon and the following: *"Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the preparation of part 2 of the annual report of the Secretary (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture), or for the payment of salary to any person engaged in the editing or preparation of such report."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the Chair is advised that the only portion of the amendment submitted by the Senator from California to the committee amendment which is in order at this time is the first part, namely, that on page 47, in line 1, where it is proposed to insert the figure "$878,268," in lieu of the figure "$1,215,268."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it would save considerable time of the Senate to consider at one time the entire amendment submitted by the Senator from California. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the entire amendment submitted by the Senator from California may be considered at this time; I wish to have the Senator's amendment considered in its entirety at one time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, this amendment relates to the appropriation of funds for the Agricultural Yearbook. I know that all Members of the Senate are familiar with the yearbooks and how they are distributed.

I should like to say at the outset that the amount of money involved is relatively small when compared with the total national budget and when compared with the amount which might be saved by amendments which have previously been rejected or by the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, which has been approved.

I submit, however, that a very important principle, apart from the amount of money affected, is involved. I think it is vital for us to recognize during this time when it is necessary to increase taxes in order to maintain the defenses of the Nation at an adequate level, that we make every possible reduction in nonmilitary expenditures. What test should be applied in making those reductions?

First, I think all of us recognize that any appropriation made by Congress, regardless of when it is made, should have a desirable purpose. I think we also recognize that there are some instances in which the purpose for which an appropriation is requested may be desirable, but the appropriation itself cannot be said to be necessary at a time when we must appropriate great sums for national defense. The principle we should apply at such a time is to eliminate the desirable but unnecessary expenditures.

It seems to me that to appropriate the funds which my amendment would eliminate would be a direct violation of that principle. I believe that the publication of the Agricultural Yearbook and its distribution by the Members of Congress, free of charge, to their constituents, is a desirable function. Certainly it is desirable for the 400 constituents in each congressional district who are lucky enough to receive a copy, free of charge, from their Representative or Senator, as the case may be. And though some may disagree, I assume it is also desirable from the standpoint of the Members of the House and the Senate who are able to distribute copies of the yearbook—which are worth approximately $2.75 each—free to these 400 constituents. However, although I admit that free distribution of this publication may ordinarily be desirable, I do not believe the publication and distribution of the yearbook meet the test of necessity.

I make that statement for several reasons, but one which I should mention in particular because I base it on an argument which was made eloquently yesterday by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who has handled this bill on the floor so expertly during the past few days. The Senator from Georgia, it will be recalled, pointed out that during the war the farmers of the Nation, with less equipment and less personnel, produced more than has been produced at any time in our history. I should like to point out that the farmers of the United States accomplished that without the benefit of the Agricultural Yearbook.

I say that we have a good precedent for the action which I ask the Senate to take in connection with this committee amendment—a precedent based on action which the Congress took during

the war, because in 1943, in both the House and the Senate, by overwhelming votes it was decided that, although the free distribution of the Agricultural Yearbook might be desirable, it was not essential at a time when the funds to be appropriated for military purposes were necessarily so large. So for the 3-year period of peak agricultural production during the war the Agricultural Yearbook was not distributed to the farmers of the United States.

I think that that precedent was a good one, and I believe that during this period, in which we are not at war, but in which we are certainly in a war economy so far as the amount necessary for national defense is concerned, we should follow that precedent.

Let me reiterate what I said at the outset. I know the argument will be made to the effect that this book does a great deal of good, that farmers are able to turn to its pages and read comments concerning various problems which they have on the farm—that is, the very fortunate few who are able to obtain copies of this book from their Representatives or Senators. I know, too, it will be said that this is a very small amount, when compared with all the funds we are appropriating for this purpose and for that purpose at home and abroad; but I say that, though the amount is small, and though the distribution of this book in ordinary times might be desirable this is a clear-cut case where the appropriation is not absolutely essential and necessary. I further urge the adoption of this amendment for another reason, one which I think will appeal to the Members of the Senate. I have been concerned, as I am sure other Members of this body have been, by the rather snide remarks which contain commentators, both in the press and on the radio have made from time to time concerning the action of the Senate and the House of Representatives in cutting appropriations for the various agencies.

I think Senators know what I mean. It is often said that the Congress is willing to cut everyone else but the Congress; that when it comes to a congressional prerogative, when it comes to anything that has to do with the expenses of the Congress, the people can be sure that the Congress will not cut itself.

Here is an opportunity for the Congress to cut itself. Oh, I know we ourselves do not get the books. It means nothing to us, financially, but it is one of the prerogatives we have—the opportunity to send to our favorite constituents these agricultural yearbooks. Here is an opportunity for the Congress to cut itself, and I believe that in so doing we shall set a good example—a good example, certainly, for the country and a good example of the application of this principle—that during this period when it is going to be necessary for this country to incur a deficit the Congress will make cuts in appropriations for purposes which may be desirable, but which are not absolutely essential.

Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. LANGER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. NIXON. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, let me congratulate the Senator from California upon his amendment, which I think is a very fine one. I would ask the Senator from California whether it is not true, as I understand his amendment, that he is merely proposing that part 2 of the yearbook not be printed.

Mr. NIXON. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Part 1 will still be retained; will it not?

Mr. NIXON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wonder whether the Senator from California would be kind enough to read some of the titles in part 2 of the yearbook, so that we could judge the value of part 2. Would the Senator read some of the titles of the yearbook in part 2?

Mr. NIXON. There are a number of titles which might be interesting.

Before reading the titles I want to emphasize one point. This cut would in no way interfere with the distribution to the farmers of agricultural bulletins, which, as we know, are distributed on a free basis to anyone desiring them. This would affect only part 2, which is a summary of the bulletins, and which more or less compiles all the bulletins into one volume.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Some of the titles in part 2 intrigued me, and I wonder whether the Senator from California would read some of them to indicate the the great popular appeal—exclamation point—which some of these articles might have.

Mr. NIXON. I shall not attempt to select any particular titles among others, because I think some relate to important and essential matters, and others do not. But, for example, I might read from the table of contents in the first part of the book. Here are some typical titles:

Removing the Glands From Cottonseed.

Transcendental Gastronomic Art.

Mechanics of Ruten Action.

Production of Riboflavin by Fermentation.

Angora, the Long-Haired Rabbit.

Feathers as a Source of Fiber.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is the Senator familiar with the fact that the greatest pressure for the cultivation of Angora rabbits is from his State of California?

Mr. NIXON. I am well aware of that, and I may say that I believe the rabbit growers in California, many of whom live in the congressional district which I formerly represented in the House, will be very willing to obtain the bulletin on Angora rabbits directly from the Department of Agriculture, which they can do even if the yearbook is not published. And after all, I should say that only about 50 out of the several thousand rabbit growers in that district would have been able to obtain the book free from his Representative in Congress anyway.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is the Senator familiar with what happened during World War II, so far as this book was concerned, in the Department of Agriculture? In other words, did not the Department recommend the elimination of this publication at the time when newsprint was scarce and when paper used by publishers was scarce, and did it not actually omit the publication of the yearbooks during the World War period?

Mr. NIXON. I think the Senator apparently was not on the floor when I discussed that point. As a matter of fact, the yearbook was dispensed with during World War II. I went back to read the debates on the subject, because I was particularly interested in it. It was eliminated for two reasons; one, because of the necessity for economy which I have mentioned; and, two, because of the scarcity of newsprint; and I may say that both those reasons, it seems to me, exist today.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from California will read some more of those very interesting titles.

Mr. NIXON. Let me first yield to the Senator from North Dakota, who has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from California whether his experience has been the same as mine, in that more than half of the yearbooks go to the young people who belong to the 4-H Clubs, the Future Farmers of America?

Mr. NIXON. I would perhaps be unable to corroborate the Senator's statement with any certainty. I do know that there were only 400 copies for distribution in a congressional district having a population of 500,000. I know also that if they do go to the members of the 4-H Clubs only a very few selected members of the 4-H Clubs obtain them. I may say further that if the book is essential, if the book is necessary, it should not be distributed free only to a selected few, but it should go to all who ask for it. As I think the Senator is quite aware, we get many requests we are unable to fill.

Mr. LANGER. Has the Senator's experience been the same as that of the senior Senator from North Dakota, that the 4-H Clubs send in petitions, signed by practically every member of the 4-H Clubs, requesting that they receive individual copies?

Mr. NIXON. As a matter of fact, that is exactly the point I was making. I have received many more requests than I have been able to fill, and I think that bears out my point that the yearbook is one which the farmer, and in many cases the city dweller—because I have I have had many applications from city people as well—would like to have on their shelves as a reference work. But, by the same token, I think that an analysis of the colloquy between the Senator from North Dakota and myself proves that the book does not meet the

test of necessity, because if it were necessary for farm production, if it were absolutely essential, then it should be distributed on a free basis to all of those who request it, rather than to a few selected persons.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from California be given an additional 2 minutes in which he may read some of the titles in the yearbook.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to yield 2 minutes to the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California wish to occupy an additional 2 minutes?

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, I should like to say that I appreciate the offer of the chairman of the committee that I may have an opportunity to read some of the titles, but the time is rapidly passing and, under the circumstances, I think the Senate would rather proceed to vote.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, of course, postponing the printing of the so-called Agricultural Yearbook is a matter which is of interest to every Senator. I have not heard all of the titles, but I might say that some of them seem quite strange to some persons, though each and every one of them represents a very real problem to some farmer or to large groups of farmers in the United States.

In order that the Senate may be informed as to what is in the book before we vote with reference to it, I wish to read a brief statement as to what it contains:

This book with illustrations to show the way to identify and control the 80 most damaging insects will enable farmers, housewives, gardeners, agricultural students, and others to instantly recognize insects and the damage they cause for more effective insect control, and will provide invaluable information in directly usable form for extension work, for land-grant colleges and other institutions in entomology, plant and forestry study courses, and in training subprofessional workers in the Department. This book should have far-reaching beneficial effects on crop production, saving of crops, and saving and preserving agricultural products in storage. It will be useful in farm and city homes, in institutions, industrial plants, and probably will be utilized for textbook purposes in schools and colleges.

Mr. President, if the Senate wishes to vote to postpone the publication of the Agricultural Yearbook, it is at perfect liberty to do so. There is a difference between dealing with insects by a man who lives on a farm as compared with some man who lives in an apartment where there are available house managers and a number of employees to kill insects and rodents and other pests that disturb those who are not so fortunately situated.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does the Senator from Georgia know that in my office I receive 10,000 calls for the Agricultural Yearbook, as compared with one call for the United States Code? That is how popular the Agricultural Yearbook is. If there is a desire to save in printing costs, let us save on the United States Code. The Agricultural Yearbook goes to persons who need it and want it. I do not send one of them out of my office unless it is requested, and I send all that I have and all that I can get from other Senators. It is a book which goes to the American farmer.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question about the popularity of the yearbook; but I have always felt that there was something unfair about the allotment of them. Each Senator receives only 450 copies, while Representatives receive 500 copies. I have never been able to comply with all the requests I have received.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The point has been made that only a few farmers receive benefit from the yearbook. The books go to boys' and girls' clubs, to rural schools and libraries, and they become reference books for the entire community. Is not that the usual practice in agricultural States?

Mr. RUSSELL. I assume that is correct. I send them to school libraries in rural communities.

Mr. STENNIS. Let me state as a fact, if I may, in the Senator's time, that I never send out one of these books without a request, and the requests far exceed the supply. Most of the requests come from groups rather than from individuals. The books take their place in the community library as the most valuable single book on the subject. I think we may well propose to abolish the publication of some other book rather than the Agricultural Yearbook.

Mr. RUSSELL, I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I correct in my belief that one of the articles in the last Agricultural Yearbook was entitled "Removing the Glands From Cotton Seed"?

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot answer that question, because, unfortunately, I did not read the last Agricultural Yearbook. I try to keep in touch with the activities of the Department of Agriculture, but I have quite a bit of other work to do. I congratulate the Senator from Illinois on the study he has made of the glands of cotton seed——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, no.

Mr. RUSSELL. But the Senator from Georgia has been unable to study the details of the subject. I shall await a time when the Senator from Illinois and I have sufficient time so that he might explain it to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered en bloc by the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON].

Mr. NIXON and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

On this vote the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—35

Bennett	Frear	Lehman
Bricker	Gillette	Lodge
Butler, Md.	Hendrickson	Martin
Carlson	Hoey	McCarthy
Dirksen	Holland	McClellan
Douglas	Ives	Millikin
Dworshak	Kem	Monroney
Ferguson	Knowland	Nixon

Saltonstall	Smith, N. J.	Wherry
Schoeppel	Smith, N. C.	Wiley
Smathers	Taft	Williams
Smith, Maine	Watkins	

NAYS—37

Aiken	Hickenlooper	McKellar
Anderson	Hill	Morse
Benton	Hunt	Mundt
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Cordon	Kerr	Russell
Eastland	Kilgore	Sparkman
Eaton	Langer	Stennis
Ellender	Magnuson	Underwood
Green	Malone	Young
Hayden	Maybank	
Hennings	McFarland	

NOT VOTING—24

Brewster	Flanders	McMahon
Bridges	Fulbright	Moody
Butler, Nebr.	George	Murray
Byrd	Humphrey	O'Conor
Cain	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Kefauver	Thye
Case	Long	Tobey
Duff	McCarran	Welker

So Mr. NIXON's amendments, en bloc, were rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the committee amendment on page 46, line 25, and page 47, line 1.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Library", on page 48, line 16, after the word "members", to strike out "$700,000" and insert "$641,237."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Special activities—Research on strategic and critical agricultural materials", on page 48, line 23, after "(50 U. S. C. 98f)", to strike out "$450,000" and insert "$650,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—Corporations", on page 51, line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$15,000,000" and insert "$16,500,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, to the committee amendment on page 51, lines 18 and 19, I send to the desk my amendment designated "7-25-51-C," which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 51, line 19, it is proposed to strike out "$16,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$15,500,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a total of $16,350,000 was appropriated last year for administrative expenses of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the year 1950-51. For this year the House committee recommended, and the House approved, an appropriation of $15,000,000. The Senate committee is recommending an appropriation of $16,500,000, or a $1,500,000 increase over the House figure.

Mr. President, I should like to point out that the Senate committee figure is $16,500,000, despite the fact that there is much less need for price support, by means of loans and purchases, because of the present high demand for farm products. The problem now is not that of a surplus farm crop. The problem is to get an adequate supply of food and provisions for the people of our country and of our potential allies. Therefore, there is much less work for the Commodity Credit Corporation to do. In the face of this situation the committee is proposing for administrative expenditures a $1,500,000 increase over the House figure.

Mr. President, I am asking by my amendment for a total appropriation of $15,500,000, $850,000 less than was voted last year and I submit that the amount I propose is more than justified in view of the changed agricultural situation. There will not be nearly so much work for the Commodity Credit Corporation to do this coming year as there was last year. The price support program on potatoes, for example, has been removed, thank goodness. Prices of cotton and corn are both above support levels and wheat is very close to it. I cannot see why we should maintain administrative expenses for the Commodity Credit Corporation at such a high level when its work has been greatly diminished.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I merely wish to make one brief statement with respect to this item. At the time the House made this reduction in the budget estimate all the agricultural commodities were above 90 percent of parity, and it was stated in the committee report that the reduction was made because of the fact that farm prices were above the loan values, and therefore the Commodity Credit Corporation would not have any considerable loan program.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand from the Senator from Georgia that the reason the Senate committee proposed to increase this figure is that the prospect is that there will be substantially larger quantities of agricultural products under the price-support program.

Mr. RUSSELL. Exactly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. How can the Senator from Georgia reconcile that with the administration's appeal for price controls to hold prices down? We are now being asked for an extra appropriation to hold prices up. I wonder if we can get an explanation of that.

Mr. RUSSELL. The explanation is very simple. I thought the Senator from Delaware, who is supposed to be an expert on control problems and the Commodity Credit Corporation, would know the answer to that question.

Both the House and the Senate committees have written into the bill a provision that no price control shall be placed on farm commodities below parity if a loan is available at 90 percent of parity. The 10-percent difference between the loan value and the price support means a profit or loss to tens of thousands of farmers, so the explanation is very simple.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If I correctly understand, this appropriation is to carry out a program for regulating the law of supply and demand, and not a program for obtaining lower prices.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to inform the Senator from Delaware that the effect of price ceilings so far has not been to hold prices down. It has been to hold them up. When a ceiling is fixed, it automatically becomes the price. Consumer prices today would be much less if there had been no effort to control prices.

I think that after the price-control bill has been finally acted upon by both Houses we shall hear more talk about price supports for the rest of the year, because unless the weather changes we are going to have exceptionally heavy crops, and price supports will likely go into operation before the end of this year on a considerable scale.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina, but I wish to conclude my explanation.

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not mean to interfere with the statement of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is not interfering. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The subject of the control bill has been brought up. The Senator from Georgia and I had the privilege of being on the subcommittee. I thoroughly agreed when we increased the amount of money for the Commodity Credit Corporation in the subcommittee and in the full committee, because, as the Senator from Georgia and other Senators from agricultural States well know, the price of wheat has gone down to 85 percent of parity. The price of cotton has gone from 45 cents to 34 cents. It is continually going down.

As the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has stated, prices have gone down because of the excellent weather. If the weather continues to be good, we shall make the biggest crops ever known in this country. The farmers planted them because the Congress, the Secretary of Agriculture, and other agencies asked them to plant them. They plowed up the hills, and they plowed up the valleys. We have the finest prospect I have ever known in my life for huge crops of wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, and other farm commodities. It was for that reason, as the Senator from Georgia well knows, that we worked together on the subcommittee to increase this appropriation so that the farmers would be protected.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate the contribution of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] made the statement that his amendment, which would provide $15,500,000, I believe, was only $850,000 less than was provided last year. However, according to the report, on page 18, the authorization for 1951 was $19,100,000. That, of course, would show a greater hiatus than that stated by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question that the Senator from New York is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is a discrepancy between the House Committee report on the agriculture bill and the Senate committee report. I have taken my figures from the House committee report. The House committee report, on page 26, shows administrative costs for the Commodity Credit Corporation for 1951 of $16,350,000. The Senate report gives a somewhat higher figure. I have worked basically from the House committee report since the Senate committee report was made available only a few days ago. I suspect that in the interim, between the issuance of the House committee report and the issuance of the Senate committee report, the Department of Agriculture has brought forth another request for a deficiency appropriation.

Mr. RUSSELL. The figure used in the House committee report was that carried in the regular appropriation bill last year. There was a supplemental appropriation of $2,750,000.

Mr. LEHMAN. The correct figure is $19,100,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. $19,100,000 is the correct figure. I thank the Senator from New York for bringing that out. The appropriation recommended by the Senate Committee is $2,500,000 under the appropriation for the current year.

I wish to state again that since the time the House made the cut, all 3 of the great staple agricultural commodities, corn, wheat, and cotton, have fallen from above the loan value to below it. We talk about an increase in farm prices, and about controls. We will have to pay more attention to a support progro mif we are to bring about the defense production which is necessary. We have the law, but it is not self-executing. Many persons are required to appraise the quality of the wheat, corn, or cotton, which goes into the loan, to make the notes, and to handle the transactions on behalf of the Government.

The price-support program will not be effective unless there are adequate funds for the Commodity Credit Corporation. Indeed, it will be hard pressed to sustain the reduction of $2,500,000 under last year's appropriation, because all indications point to the fact that there will be more corn, more wheat, and more cotton placed under Commodity Credit Corporation loans in 1952 than there was in 1951.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I should like to point out that agricultural commodities are not the only ones with respect to which there are support prices. Let me refer to a few others. With respect to aluminum, the floor price, or the minimum figure at which the Government will support the price, is 19 cents a pound; tungsten, $63 per short ton unit; copper, 20 cents a pound; molybdenum, 90 cents a pound.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Of course, the greater the crop, the greater the administrative expense.

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly. We begged the farmers to produce these commodities. Our reserves are being exhausted. The Commodity Credit Corporation has no reserves of cotton, wheat, and corn. One crop failure could cause actual hunger in the United States, not to speak of other areas of the world. The purpose of this program is to provide for an orderly handling of the loan program, and the amendment to the amendment ought to be rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield for a question. I hope the Senator from Delaware does not wish to make a statement on my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Georgia just made the statement that there is no surplus of corn or wheat in this country today, and that if we suffered a crop failure, we would be in difficulties. Is the Senator aware of the fact that as recently as 3 months ago the Commodity Credit Corporation was carrying on its books 100,000,000 bushels of wheat and cotton as nonessential and surplus?

Mr. RUSSELL. I know that cotton is not measured in bushels. I am not familiar with the figures which the Senator gives.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation has disposed of $600,000,000 worth of cotton since the war broke out in Korea, and that some of it has gone to Red China?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not familiar with that as a fact. I know that the Commodity Credit Corporation has depleted its supplies, and that it made quite a handsome profit, over and above what had been loaned to the farmers.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It made a profit of about $28,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should think the Senator from Delaware would welcome any profit made by the Commodity Credit Corporation. He speaks disparagingly of a $28,000,000 profit.

Mr. WILLIAMS. When a shortage of cotton is contemplated and the administration liquidates $580,000,000 worth of cotton and exports some of it to Red China when our armies are fighting a war, such action cannot be justified on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not undertaking to justify any exports of cotton to Red China; and I hope that no Senator will vote to strike down the loan program of the American farmer because of the charge of the Senator from Delaware that cotton or wheat was exported to Red China. It may have been. If it was, I deplore it and denounce it. But that has nothing to do with the immediate question before the Senate, and should not prejudice Senators in voting on this amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has any evidence that any Government agency has been shipping cotton to Red China, I am certain that our Subcommittee on Merchant Marine will be very glad to have the facts presented to it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I point out to the Senator from Washington that the facts have been documented and are before the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine. It was all authorized by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does the Senator mean that a Government agency has been shipping cotton to Red China?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The shipments were authorized through the World Commerce Corp. in New York. The exchange was for soy beans from Red China. Five different shipments were made, and they are all documented in the RECORD. I shall be very glad to furnish the information to the Senator from Washington. I do not have it before me at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That was prior to this situation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It was prior to this situation, but since the outbreak of the war in Korea last June.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment on page 51, line 19.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 51, line 19.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—General provisions," on page 56, after line 13, to strike out:

SEC. 407. No part of the funds made available by this act may be used to compensate any person for employment in the Federal service outside the continental limits of the United States at a rate higher than is paid for comparable work in the Federal service within the continental limits of the United States, other than a person who was a resident citizens of the continental United States at the date of his appointment to a position outside the continental limits of the United States and has had continuous employment in the Federal service (except as interrupted by service in the Armed Forces of the United States) from the date of such appointment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 1, to change the section number from "408" to "407."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 8, to change the section number from "409" to "408."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 7-25-51—H, which I offer on behalf of myself and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Sen-

ator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 11, line 7, beginning with the colon, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including the word "year" in line 11.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the pending bill on page 11, line 7, appropriates the sum of $12,800,000 for the inspection of meat and meat products. Of course it is a very essential and desirable service. Its purpose is to prevent diseased and unwholesome meat going into interstate commerce. The bill as now reported by the committee contains, after the appropriation of $12,800,000, the following language: "*Provided*, That hereafter reimbursement may be made by any person, firm, or organization for the expenses of meat inspection in excess of those which can be met from the amount appropriated for such purpose of each year."

The provision which I have just read has been interpreted by the Department of Agriculture to mean that the meat-packing industry may be assessed for any additional cost of inspection above the $12,800,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Did the Senator say the Department of Agriculture had put that construction on the language?

Mr. KEM. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Representatives of the Department testified directly to the contrary. They stated that they interpreted the provision to mean that when a packer himself requests that the Department give services over and above those embraced within the appropriation such services should be chargeable to them. There is nothing mandatory about it.

Mr. KEM. I understood that the other interpretation would be placed on it. However, the interpretation suggested by the Senator from Georgia is equally objectionable. It involves the principle which is involved in the case of a man who pays the judge who is to try him. It involves the principle of a packer whose meat is being inspected paying the inspector who is to decide whether or not the meat is to go into interstate commerce. It is a very undesirable provision.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no strong feeling about the amendment. At the present time the packers are paying several million dollars by way of overtime. It is covered in the law which was sponsored by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. The law to which the Senator from Georgia refers is Public Law 610, and it provides that Congress should return to the principle that the inspection was in the public interest and should be paid for by the public. It seems to me that under the proviso which I have read, we are departing from that principle, to the extent that we are permitting certain inspections to be made at the expense of those whose product is being inspected.

It is objectionable for another reason. It was found that when the expense was placed on the persons whose product was being inspected in some cases it amounted to a considerable part of the expense of their doing business, with the result that some companies went into intrastate business. In other words, they sold their products within the State in which the animals were slaughtered, with the result that they did not have to pay the inspection charge. Therefore the purveyors of the inspected meat were placed at a distinct disadvantage with those who were operating in intrastate commerce and not paying for the inspection.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. I am in accord with the motives of the Senator from Missouri. I am wondering whether the proviso was not inserted so as to make it possible to overcome the wage-hour laws, under which the Federal inspectors are required to quit work at 5 o'clock, for example. They can work only so many hours a week. Last year we enacted legislation which would permit inspection at the border of plants and animals being brought into the country. A rather serious situation had developed because animals coming in from Canada or fruit coming up through Florida would be turned back at the border if the animals or fruit did not reach the inspecting station before 5 o'clock in the evening. Congress enacted legislation which would permit the importer to pay the cost of inspection. I wonder if the inspection of meat would fall into the same category.

Mr. KEM. I will say to the Senator from Vermont that his is still another interpretation which might be placed on the language. I believe it is also objectionable. If we are to go through the back door in an effort to avoid the application of the wage-hour law, it should be spelled out, and Congress ought to know what it is doing.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. KEM. I should first like to complete my statement, and then I shall be very happy to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I merely wanted to make sure that the Senator's amendment would do what he believes it would do.

Mr. KEM. I believe it would. It would mean that any inspection of meat for shipment in interstate commerce would be paid for by the public, on the ground that the inspection of meat is in the public interest. That is what the bill which Congress passed 4 years ago undertook to do. As I understand, with the exception of the overtime feature, which the Senator from Vermont mentions, that is what has been done ever since. I believe it to be a sound procedure. I think it is one that we should continue to follow. To permit persons whose product is inspected to pay for the inspection service is definitely unsound and objectionable.

I should like to yield to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] who is interested in the amendment.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

I have nothing to add to the very excellent presentation which has been made by the Senator from Missouri, except to say that a matter of principle is involved. A service to the public should be paid for by the public. The extension which is contemplated by the proviso in the bill would leave an opportunity for collusion, and such an opportunity should not be left open. If additional money is needed for the service, Congress should provide the additional money. It is a public service, and it ought to be charged to the Treasury.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection to taking the amendment to conference.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the amendment? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KEM. Do I understand that the amendment has been agreed to?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has been agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 7-24-51-D.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. —. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 765), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to all sums heretofore authorized to be appropriated for such purpose, the sum of $4,000,000 to be available only for access roads for the prospecting and mining of uranium deposits and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the sum authorized by this section shall be available for contract immediately upon the passage of this act: *Provided further*, That the roads authorized to be constructed under this section shall be certified to the Secretary of Commerce as important to the national defense by the Secretary of Defense or such other official as the President may designate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to ask whether the last amendment was adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was adopted; the Chair so announced that.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair for the announcement. I certainly did not hear the announcement. I appreciate having the Chair make the announcement. To me it makes a great deal of difference whether an amendment is adopted or simply is taken to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment was adopted. It cannot be taken to conference unless it is adopted.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think there is a real difference between adopting an amendment and simply taking it to conference. If the Senate adopts an amendment, I think the conferees then are under instructions in regard to the

amendment. On the other hand, if an amendment is simply taken to conference, such instructions do not apply.

I hope that the interpretation to be made following the adoption of the amendment, is that it is to be taken to conference with instructions to the conferees on the part of the Senate, as in the case of any other amendment which is adopted by the Senate.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I realize that my amendment is subject to a point of order; I say frankly that the amendment is legislation offered to an appropriation bill. There can be no question about that.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I undestood the Chair to say, regarding the preceding amendment, that the amendment was adopted, without objection. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair asked whether there was objection to the adoption of the amendment. The Chair announced that there was no objection, and that the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I want the RECORD at least to show that I was on my feet seeking recognition because I wished to speak on the amendment and to object to it.

However, I know of no way by which I can do so at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was not aware of the fact that the Senator from Michigan was attempting to obtain recognition. When the Senator from Georgia announced that he did not object to the amendment, the Chair put the question on agreeing to the amendment, and did not realize that any Senator was seeking recognition.

Mr. KEM. I am perfectly willing to have the vote on the amendment reconsidered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I do not yield for that purpose, because that procedure might take considerable time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I do not wish to embarrass the chairman of the subcommittee who is handling the bill on the floor of the Senate; but I present the amendment solely for the reason that there is certain work which the Atomic Energy Commission needs to do in connection with the development of ores. I am happy that the Senator from Colorado, who is a member of the special raw materials committee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is now on the floor.

I say frankly that I recognize that this amendment is legislation offered to an appropriation bill. However, it is urgent that certain access roads should be built on the Rocky Mountain Plateau, in order to make it possible to reach certain very high grade, fine ores which have been discovered there. Much of the work needs to be done in the State of Colorado at relatively high elevations, and some work needs to be done in Utah, and some in Arizona, and some in New Mexico.

The work to be done in New Mexico amounts to approximately $100,000, whereas the work to be done in Arizona amounts to approximately $282,000, that in Utah amounts to approximately $1,158,500, and that in Colorado to $2,339,000. The Senator from Arizona has assured me that as long as we keep the ratio at at least 1 to 23 or 24, he is happy. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I wish to point out that provision for this work normally would come before us in connection with the ordinary road bill. However, we are merely seeking an opportunity to have the work started before the snows come in Colorado and make it impossible for the work to be done.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me say to my colleague that the regular road bill will be before the Congress within the very near future, and there is no particular reason why items of this nature should not be considered when that bill is before the Senate.

As a matter of fact, last year in connection with the consideration of the road bill, the Committee on Public Works recommended that $25,000,000 be appropriated for the construction of access roads. However, at the instance of the administration, on the day when we began to consider the road bill, a request came to the floor of the Senate, when the Senate was meeting in the old Senate Chamber, that we reduce that item by $15,000,000, which we did.

Certainly an appropriation item of this type should not be handled in connection with the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I announced that in the beginning; I recognize that this item does not belong in this bill. I am merely trying to say that the snows come very early in western Colorado and remain on the ground and on the roads for a long time. If the work is not begun at once, it will have to go over until the summer of 1952, and we thought that would be most unfortunate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Department of Commerce appropriation bill is being considered by a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of which I am a member, and that bill will be marked up in a few days and will come to the floor of the Senate shortly thereafter. I think that is the proper place for this item.

For that reason, I object, on the ground that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree that this item belongs in that bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield, and will the Senator from Michigan withhold the objection temporarily?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is nothing before the Senate to which objection can be made. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has stated that a point of order would be made, but no point of order has been made thus far.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I was withholding making the point of order, in order to permit the Senator from New Mexico to explain the amendment.

Of course, under clause 4 of rule XVI, the chairman of the committee is under the obligation of making a point of order against any amendment which is legislation on an appropriation bill unless the committee has specifically voted to the contrary.

So I have withheld making the point of order until the Senator from New Mexico has had an opportunity to explain the amendment to the Senate.

Let me inquire whether the Senator from New Mexico has yielded the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I simply yield now to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, this matter does not lend itself to leisurely consideration.

Our country is excessively dependent upon foreign sources for the raw materials basic to our atomic-energy program. The location referred to by the junior Senator from New Mexico is a most important source of supply in the United States, and we cannot reach that source of supply unless roads are available.

I realize, as does the junior Senator from New Mexico, that this amendment is out of order in connection with this appropriation bill.

But, nevertheless, the subject admits of no delay in its handling and its importance should override technical objections.

In the end, I think the Senate will heartily approve the item, regardless of whether it comes up in connection with the pending appropriation bill or in connection with a later one. But either way it needs to be taken care of most promptly.

As the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has pointed out, the winter closes in very early in that region. If the work is not done during the present season, the work will have to wait another year. However, the atomic energy program is not and should not be fashioned to such delay.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am impressed with the importance of the amendment. It may be that rule XVI is an antiquated rule. However, that rule makes no exception, even in the case of atomic energy matters, to the instruction to the chairman of the committee having the appropriation bill in charge that he make the point of order against legislative proposals which have not been approved by the committee.

Therefore, Mr. President, I reluctantly make the point of order against the amendment, as legislation offered to an appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have pending at the desk a motion to suspend the rule, notwithstanding the point of order. That motion has been given previously in writing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion will be——

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to agree with my colleague, for I know the importance of this matter. However, I, for one, on behalf of the Committee on Public Works, am not going to agree to let any other committee handle proposed legislation for my committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] yield to his colleague? The time is now controlled, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I assure the junior Senator from New Mexico that I appreciate the importance of what he is trying to do, but I also wish to inform my colleague that I am not going to agree to have him or any other Senator try to legislate for my committee. We might as well understand that now.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the Committee on Public Works is one of the standing committees of the Senate, and it is the standing committee which has jurisdiction of all matters relating to roads. There is no reason for circumventing that committee in connection with such matters.

If the matter referred to by my colleague is an essential one, let him present it to our committee, and we shall consider it immediately.

On the other hand, there is no reason why we should permit any Senator to circumvent that committee, in connection with proposed legislation which comes within the jurisdiction of the committee.

Therefore I shall oppose the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] moves that the rule be suspended in order that he may offer the amendment, which has been declared out of order. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not sure that any Senator wants to speak against the motion, or, for that matter, in favor of it; but the time for debate on the motion is the same as the time for debate on an amendment, is it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It carries the same time, and it is under the same control.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I do not desire to use any of the time.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair cannot recognize any Senator, unless he is yielded to.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Iowa such time as he may desire.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I shall take but 2 or 3 minutes. I understand the zeal with which committee chairmen protect the prerogatives of their committees, and it is commendable. Under normal circumstances, I would support that prerogative and the vigorous defense of the sanctity of committee jurisdiction; but I think there are occasions when the exigencies of a situation may dictate a little relaxation of that rule from the rigidity with which it is often observed.

In this matter I thoroughly agree with the junior Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Colorado, that it cannot be overemphasized that uranium, in its discovery, development, and production, is most vital to the national security and economy. Under such circumstances, it seems to me that the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico might be considered without ruffling the dignity of the Public Works Committee.

In my opinion, since the public security is involved, the interests of the Nation can best be served by voting favorably on the motion to suspend the rule, and, therefore, I shall support the Senator's motion to suspend the rule so that the amendment may be considered at this time.

These important access roads, I believe, are highly essential, and the quicker they are made available the better off we shall be. The weather, unfortunately, will not wait upon the definition of the rights and prerogatives of senatorial committees. We have an opportunity to provide something which I think is highly essential. I earnestly hope the rule will be suspended and that we may have a vote on the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does either one of the Senators yield time to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall have to oppose the amendment. For that reason, I ask the Senator from Georgia whether he will yield to me.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, of course, I have only 15 minutes. I shall be glad to yield the Senator from Nebraska 5 minutes, if he desires it.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not need that much time. I merely wish to say that I should like to accommodate the Senator from New Mexico, as he knows, as I think his amendment is a worthy one. But it is necessary to have rules under which we may operate. If we start to relax them, then we shall presently have no rules at all. I am rather jealous of the work done by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Let me ask the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico whether he could not present this matter to the Public Works Committee. The committee could have a meeting tomorrow. Of course, I am not undertaking to tell the committee what it should do, but the committee could consider the subject. The Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill is expected to be taken up tomorrow, following the disposition of the pending bill, and that would give the Public Works Committee an opportunity to study the matter. In that way the Senator from New Mexico would be complying with the rules, and if the committee desired to include this amendment as a provision in the next bill, I should have no objection. If the legislative committee had had this matter in charge, if it had known about it, and if it could have been considered by the committee, I should have had no objection to its inclusion in an appropriation bill.

I wanted the Senator to know that, because I shall have to vote against the motion to suspend the rule. I am asking the Senator whether what I suggest is not a good way out of the difficulty. If my suggestion were followed, everyone would be accommodated and we would still preserve the rules of procedure of the Senate.

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the Senator from Nebraska that I shall have no objection to handling it in that way or in any other way. I am offering this amendment only because of my appointment by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy as a member of a special subcommittee to survey raw materials on a world-wide basis. That survey by the subcommittee, of which the distinguished Senator from Colorado is a member, revealed the fact that is extremely important to do some work on the Colorado plateau. The distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who was formerly chairman of the Senate members of the joint committee, recognizes its importance, and therefore the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy requested that this matter be presented on the floor of the Senate. I then, in turn, endeavored to ascertain how that might quickly be done. I was informed that, rather than wait for a bill, which would not make possible the consideration of the matter until October, it would be better and more expeditious to follow the course which I am now pursuing. There is no desire to interfere with the jurisdiction of any other committee. If Senators think the amendment should be referred to a committee, I am agreeable to that.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I trust the Senator does not think that I am opposing the amendment. I am for it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I understand that.

Mr. WHERRY. But I believe that by following the method I have suggested, the Senator can accomplish his purpose with the loss of but one day. I feel sure the Public Works Committee would give the matter speedy consideration.

Mr. ANDERSON. There was no desire on my part to bypass anyone.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that.

Mr. ANDERSON. I made inquiry as to the quickest way of bringing the matter to the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has and budget estimate been made for this proposal?

Mr. ANDERSON. There is a general budget estimate covering access roads. The Bureau of the Public Roads forwarded to the Budget Bureau its request

about July 22. It has not yet been acted upon. It will normally go to the committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Have we received anything at all from the Bureau of Public Roads with reference to the proposed legislation?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am sure the Bureau is aware of the very interesting development in Colorado and Utah. The situation is extremely promising. Some very interesting sites have been developed. As the Senator from Colorado stated, the problem is not so pleasant as it might be. It involves about $4,000,000 of immediate work. I had thought the matter could be handled expeditiously in the way suggested by me. If it cannot be, there will be no hard feelings on my part. I was merely endeavoring to carry out the mandate of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair cannot recognize any Senator, unless time is yielded to him.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, if I have any time, I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Florida.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico has control of the time in connection with his motion.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Florida such time as he desires, whatever that means.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. President, the Senator from Florida happens to be serving as chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works. Assuming that the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee would refer such an item as this to that subcommittee, the Senator from Florida would be glad to give it preferred and immediate, urgent consideration, in an effort to cooperate to the fullest extent in obtaining speedy action. The Senator from Florida would suggest that, assuming the distinguished chairman of the committee would refer the matter to the subcommittee, referred to by me, the item might be submitted at this time and the Senator from Florida makes bold simply to make the suggestion as a proposed amendment to the next appropriation bill which comes up; and certainly the Senator from Florida will cooperate to the fullest extent, and he is sure the chairman of the committee will do likewise.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me for a few minutes?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am happy to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I maintain that all the other Members of this body are as patriotic as those who belong to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and that we are all trying to do our duty. There is an appropriate standing committee to take care of matters like that suggested by the junior Senator from New Mexico. I realize the importance of the proposal as much as does any patriotic member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I realize the importance of it, and I am interested in the States referred to. I belong to that area. I belong to Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Arizona. But I think we should get Mr. MacDonald, of the Bureau of Public Roads, to tell us whether it is absolutely necessary and can be done. At least, we could call someone from the Bureau of the Budget, and say, "You are requested to approve this project. What do you think about it?"

The Senator from Florida is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Roads of the Public Works Committee. I know we want to cooperate with him. I know he is a diligent and hard worker. All we ask is that the matter not be handled in the way which has been suggested. What difference would a delay of 1 day make? What difference would a month's delay make?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the distinguished Senator from New Mexico have any objection to the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have no objection to reporting such a measure, even if it requires working at night.

Mr. WHERRY. And the Senator would do everything that he could to have it reported from the committee, would he not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course. But I do object to taking action in the manner here proposed. I do not think it is fair to the Senate. If we have any respect for our standing committees, let us proceed correctly.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. ANDERSON. If there is the faintest objection to handling the proposal in the manner I have suggested, I have no objection to withdrawing the motion and turning the subject matter over to the proper committee. I presented the subject because of the question of time. I did not realize that if the question of an access road to a uranium deposit arose, the Atomic Energy Commission did not have a right to ask a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to present it.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Under the Defense Production Act, does not the Defense Minerals Administration have funds for the construction of access roads to critical mineral deposits?

Mr. ANDERSON. All I can say is that apparently they do not have funds for this matter, the roads contemplated by my amendment, and they have become urgent in view of revelations which have been made as to how much material is available in this country, and how much is available abroad. It was felt that it was extremely necessary to get the project started. I did not realize that it was crossing the lines of any committee.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from New Mexico understands, of course, that the Senator from Idaho realizes the importance of the Senator's proposal, and is only pointing out that funds have been provided for this purpose. I am perfectly sure that the funds are still available.

Mr. ANDERSON. The record which I have shows that the program which I have discussed was presented and received the full approval of the Defense Minerals Administration, and was certified to the Bureau of Public Roads. That was done some time ago.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico a question. In view of the fact that the House Public Works Committee this morning turned down what has been considered as the most vital and critical development from the standpoint of defense and security, the St. Lawrence seaway project, is there any likelihood that this same committee would approve the building of roads in the mountains of Colorado?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have yielded 5 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico. Has that time expired?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Did I correctly understand that the Senator from New Mexico withdrew his motion?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I have not done so, but I have no desire to insist upon the amendment. The proposal was originally approved by the Atomic Energy Commission on April 19; the Defense Minerals Administration approved it on May 9; the Atomic Energy Commission asked for approval on May 23, and the Defense Minerals Administration approved the request on May 31, and certified it to the Commissioner of Public Roads.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield a minute?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield two additional minutes to the senior Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Apparently the Atomic Energy Commission was making requests of everyone except the committee which has jurisdiction over the subject. Today, when my distinguished colleague spoke about the matter, was the first time the Committee on Public Works ever had any notice that money was needed for the purpose suggested. The Atomic Energy Commission may have had something in mind in January; it may have discussed the subject with the Bureau of Public Roads or with the Defense Minerals Administration, or with some other agency, but not one word was given to the legislative committee which was the only one having jurisdiction of the subject.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I do not care to labor the merits or demerits of the case, but I do want to make the record clear and to keep it clear. I do not concede that the Committee on Public Works has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this amendment. I contend that under the Atomic Energy Act the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Senate section of that committee have complete jurisdiction. I understand that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] will contest that statement. I am merely raising the point at this time so that silence will not be construed as giving consent that the Committee on Public Works should have jurisdiction over highways or any other matters which have specific and sole reference to the development and progress of atomic energy.

I refer Senators to the Atomic Energy Act itself for future study of the subject. I want to make the RECORD clear that, in my opinion, and, I believe, in the opinion of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, that is the committee which should have jurisdiction over the particular roads involved in the amendment, and not the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time remains to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Two minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I promised the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] 2 minutes. In keeping with that promise, I yield him 2 minutes at this time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall divide that time with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], if that is agreeable.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is entirely agreeable.

Mr. HOLLAND. While I have great respect for the Senator from Iowa, I believe the position he takes is not justified by the law. If he is correct, all Army and Navy matters would be handled by the Armed Services Committee. That has not been the case at all, because many such matters have been handled by the Public Works Committee. The Senator from Florida will be glad to be bound by the ruling of the Presiding Officer or by determination of the Senate as to whether the Senator from Iowa is correct in his position.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield the remaining time to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, this is a road matter which should apparently go to the Department of Commerce. It involves a sudden emergency. It was the feeling, as expressed by the Senator from Iowa, that since it involved an access road to a uranium deposit, it fell within the purview of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I knew of no other way to bring the subject up.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator could have introduced a bill and could have permitted the Presiding Officer to determine the jurisdiction.

Mr. ANDERSON. A bill is coming along.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I desire merely to clarify the RECORD, because we can accomplish nothing by arguing the jurisdiction of committees at this point, and I am only trying to preserve the RECORD as I believe it should be preserved, in view of the specific terms of the Atomic Energy Act. I do not have the act before me, but it will be found that it provides that all matters touching and affecting atomic energy and its development shall be referred to and be in the jurisdiction of this Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I believe it presents a peculiar and unique situation in the law. It is not a matter of following custom, but is a matter of statutory provision which I believe could be very properly interpreted as giving the Joint Committee control over legislation affecting atomic energy. I merely make that statement for the RECORD.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, who is in control of the time?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Colorado such time as is left to me.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to suggest that the matter be passed, without prejudice, to whatever committee has proper jurisdiction. This in view of the assurance of the chairman of the Public Works Committee that the committee will give this matter prompt attention. I would hate to see the matter snarled up in a jurisdictional squabble. So far as I am concerned, as a member of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, while not conceding that the Committee on Public Works has jurisdiction, but certainly believing that our position in what we are trying to do here will be improved by the support of that committee, I would suggest that the matter be passed, and that it be brought up again in connection with the next legislation that is before us.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, since the subject involves primary roads within the State represented by the Senator from Colorado, I withdraw the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] withdraws the motion.

Are there any further amendments?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations I offer a legislative amendment which I ask to have stated. It relates to the international wheat agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 50, after line 14 it is proposed to insert the following:

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury by canceling notes issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury in the amount of $76,808,000 for the net costs during the fiscal year 1950 under the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C. 1641–1642).

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this amendment has been discussed several times during the consideration of the bill. It grows out of the international wheat agreement which was ratified by the Senate several years ago. Under that agreement a world price is fixed for wheat, and all the signatory states agree to put a certain amount of wheat on the market at a certain price. The world price of wheat, as established by that agreement, is considerably below the domestic price for American wheat. Therefore, because of the action of the Senate in ratifying the agreement by the method provided by the Constitution, there is a deficit, which threatens to become a permanent annual deficit, of some $76,000,000, that being the difference between the domestic price of the quantity of wheat exported under the terms of the international agreement and the world price as fixed in the agreement.

The House placed this very provision in the bill, because it is a matter which must be handled in some way or some fashion. It went out on a point of order on the floor of the House. As directed by the committee, I now offer the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to have 5 minutes to speak on this matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am sure that the distinguished minority leader, who has the time of the opposition in charge, will be glad to yield to the Senator from Delaware. The minority leader is not on the floor at the moment. I shall be glad to lend 5 minutes to be used by the Senator from Delaware, if he will request the minority leader to repay me the 5 minutes when he returns to the Chamber.

I see that the distinguished minority leader has just entered the Chamber.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have always opposed the policy of canceling notes as a way of raising the money to pay for any of these programs because the use of such a method provides one way which makes it impossible for the taxpayers of America to realize just what the programs cost. It is a bad precedent to establish. I am not now debating the merits or demerits of the International Wheat Agreement. I realize that that agreement is the law, and that the loss in question will have to be taken care of. But I think an appropriation to pay the loss should be made in an appropriation bill as a direct appropriation.

In the pending appropriation bill there is indicated a saving of $24,000,000 below last year's appropriation. I point out that already this appropriation bill does not include the $427,000,000 of note cancellations, which are equally expensive so far as the American taxpayers are

concerned. If we include that figure, which must be included in the over-all balance, and deduct the $2,000,000 which we have saved after 2 days of voting, we will have a bill which will cost the American taxpayers $1,176,770,130. Compare that figure with the appropriation bill of last year for the Department of Agriculture of $776,199,700, and it will be found that there is an increase of approximately 40 percent over and above last year's appropriation.

If we are going to spend $75,000,000 for the International Wheat Agreement, I think the American people ought to know exactly what it is costing them to sell American wheat cheaper to foreigners than the price for which it is being sold to the American people.

Therefore, I make the point of order that the proposed amendment is out of order, and that the provision should come before the Senate in the form of an appropriation item.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I call up my motion to suspend the rule, which was filed on the 23d of this month.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia calls up his motion to suspend the rule.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has not yet recognized the Senator from Delaware. The Chair recognized the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it does not matter how this item is handled. I cannot see how it avails anything at all to adopt the suggestion of the Senator from Delaware as compared with that which was proposed by the House Committee on Appropriations. It is essential that this money be repaid in some way. Senators who do not favor the International Wheat Agreement should have raised that issue when the agreement was pending on the floor of the Senate. I do not recall that there was any substantial opposition to it. So I feel constrained to ask that the Senate vote upon the motion to suspend the rule.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me? I should tell the Senator from Georgia first that I am not going to support his motion.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont, anyway.

Mr. AIKEN. I am in favor of the International Wheat Agreement. In fact, on behalf of the American delegation I proposed it to the FAO conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] or the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] yield to the Senator from Vermont? Let us find out in whose time the Senator from Vermont is speaking.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I shall assume to act for the minority leader, and yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. While I am in favor of the International Wheat Agreement, and I think the loss we will sustain is probably less than the loss we would have sustained through the support program had we not had such an agreement, yet I agree with the Senator from Delaware that the way proposed is not the way to pay the loss.

I disagree with the Senator from Delaware when he says we are setting a precedent, because we have been doing all the time what is now proposed to be done. But paying expenses through the medium of cancellation of notes by the Treasury is just not good business. The expenditure never shows up in an appropriation bill. The public never knows what the cost has been to our Government. I think that this is a matter which should properly come up in an appropriation bill, so that the people will know exactly what the program is costing them. As I say, I am in favor of the program. I think the cost will be less than we would otherwise sustain, but I think this matter should come up in the regular order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will one of the Senators who are in favor of the appropriation offer an amendment to that effect? Senators have stated that they voted for the international wheat agreement. They are partly responsible for the loss under that program, and the object of this proposal is to take care of it. If the Senator will offer an amendment to take care of the loss of $76,808,000, I shall be glad to withdraw the motion to suspend the rule, and support the Senator's amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not inclined to offer a technical amendment, but the subject should come up as a direct appropriation. I shall be glad to support a direct appropriation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Let the Senator propose an appropriation, and I shall be glad to support it.

Mr. AIKEN. To appropriate the money to take care of this expense?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. Let the Senator submit such a proposal.

Mr. AIKEN. The reason I oppose so strongly the cancellation of notes by the Treasury is that in past years we have spent hundreds of millions—I think in the neighborhood of $2,000,000,000—that we never had any record of as appropriations.

Mr. RUSSELL. I can see that argument. I know that the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Delaware have ample votes on the other side of the aisle to defeat the motion to suspend the rule. They may leave the matter in such shape that the loss can never be paid. They may adopt that policy. I shall be very happy to support an appropriation item for it, but it seems to me that it is a great responsibility for a political body to take, to say that we will not assume the responsibility for taking care of a loss under an international treaty which was sponsored on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. AIKEN. If I had an amendment prepared, I should be very glad to offer it, making a direct appropriation for this purpose. I will support such an amendment, if one is offered for that purpose, so that the loss would appear as a direct appropriation and not as a cancellation of notes by the Treasury.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a few minutes to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, how much time is available to the opposition?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The opposition has 13 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I agree with the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Delaware and the distinguished Senator from Vermont. This is a practice which has grown up, but it is a very unsound practice so far as the finances of the Government are concerned. The American people—and, I venture to say, many of the officials of the Government—do not realize actually what has been occurring over the years. The forthright way to deal with the problem is to deal with it by direct appropriation so that the Congress will have an opportunity to pass upon it.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has made the statement that an amendment should be offered to provide for a direct appropriation. I think that is the way it should be done. I do not know that it is going to be a killing matter if this question is not acted upon in this appropriation bill. Supplemental bills will come along. The item could be included as a direct appropriation in such a supplemental bill or in a deficiency bill, whichever we choose to call it. We could have hearings on it and it could be brought up and acted upon at that time. It will add only one more round to some of the unsound fiscal policies if we fail to act upon it now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I will yield 2 minutes more to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. We are not curtailing the Commodity Credit Corporation or anything of the kind. The Commodity Credit Corporation has funds with which to operate. If this item is acted upon as a direct appropriation, and the Senator from Georgia does not wish to offer an amendment at this time, it could be acted upon in connection with a supplemental bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I now offer an amendment in the nature of a direct appropriation. I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated. I temporarily withhold the motion to suspend the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert:

> To discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury for the net costs during the fiscal year 1950, under the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C. 1641–1642), $76,808,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will recognize one of the Senators in control of the time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator from Illinois wish?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Two minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, ordinarily I might not be against such a proposal as this, but I notice from the hearings that there were two meager pages of testimony on this item in the Senate hearings. In the House hearings some tables were inserted, and there were a couple of pages of testimony.

Frankly I find myself very reluctant suddenly to approve an amendment calling for an appropriation of $76,808,000 without having a little more information about it and being able to tell what the dispersal of this fund was in the first instance.

I am generally familiar with the International Wheat Agreement, but it seems to me rather an untoward circumstance to undertake the consideration of a $76,000,000 amendment at this hour of the day, with nothing more to support it than the statements which have been made.

I am not unmindful of the fact that there has heretofore been discussion of it. I agree with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] that when we undertake the course of directing the Secretary of the Treasury to cancel the notes of the Commodity Credit Corporation, it does not mean anything to the Congress or the country unless we have a little more data on the subject. It seems to me that a little more time should be devoted to the question. I am constrained to vote against the amendment, even though on further analysis I might find myself in support of it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield 2 minutes to me so that I may support his amendment, now that I think it is in the proper form?

The VICE PRESIDENT. How much time does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield 4 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this appropriation is to meet an obligation which has already been incurred by the United States Government under the authorization of the Congress.

We have two programs in this country relating to wheat. One is a price-support program, under which the Government acquires wheat or makes loans upon wheat. We are also a member of the International Wheat Agreement whereby we agree to sell so many million bushels—about 180,000,000 bushels of wheat a year—allocated among different countries, at the world wheat market price, which last year was less than the support price. This amount of $76,800,000 is the amount required to make up the difference between what we sold the wheat for in the world market and what the support price was, at which the Commodity Credit Corporation acquired it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does that include administrative expenses, and does it include the expenses of officials traveling all over the world? What are the items making up the $76,800,000?

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, this is the loss sustained on the wheat. I do not know how far over the world our people have gone. I do not think they have had to travel too far. The Food and Agriculture Organization, to which the United States contributes money for administrative expenses, has, I believe, supervised the program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It does embrace $129,000 of administrative costs and $1,100,000 plus for interest.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not question that statement of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That information is in the hearings.

Mr. AIKEN. This amount represents an obligation already incurred under the authorization of the Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is this amendment germane to the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course the amendment is germane to the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I am only asking the question. I should like to have some explanation of it. An amendment is offered providing for an appropriation of $76,800,000 to pay back the Commodity Credit Corporation. That does not involve Indian wheat. We are merely canceling notes of $76,800,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; we are not.

Mr. WHERRY. The amendment offered, which was legislation on an appropriation bill was justified on the basis that it had to do with the Indian wheat. The amendment provides that we discharge the obligation of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the extent of $76,800,000.

Mr. AIKEN. That amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. WHERRY. There is nothing in the amendment which seems to me to be germane to the subject matter of the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. We have another amendment before us now.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there can be no question as to the germaneness of this item of appropriation. The obligation was incurred under an international treaty, which, under the Constitution, is a part of the supreme law of the land. The treaty was ratified on the floor of the Senate on June 13, 1949. It was brought forward as introducing a great element of stability into the wheat-price structure of the world. Very frankly, I did not look with a great deal of favor on the International Wheat Agreement. I was quite suspicious of it. But all our brethern from the wheat-producing States were apparently unanimous in their opinion that it would be a great thing not only for the wheat growers, but for the international relations of the United States and the stabilization of wheat prices. It was supported here very vigorously by Senators representing wheat-producing States.

Any Senator who heard the argument that was made on the floor of the Senate when the treaty was pending knew that there would be an annual loss under the treaty. I was very suspicious of the treaty at the time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not remember whether I voted against it or in favor of it. It was certainly my disposition to vote against it. If I voted in favor of ratification it was perhaps because of the appeals of the Senators from the wheat-producing States. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say that the International Wheat Agreement has produced the effect which was expected. It has materially increased the export market of American wheat. If it were not for the 180,000,000 bushels of American wheat which are being distributed under the terms of the International Wheat Agreement, I believe the domestic wheat market would be in very serious trouble.

The amount involved in the amendment is $76,000,000. I know it looks like a great deal of money. However, it is much less than it would take to support the price of wheat on the market in the absence of the International Wheat Agreement. As someone has remarked, the market price for wheat today is somewhat under the support level, and is likely to be considerable lower before the snow flies.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Vermont made the same argument when the treaty was pending. I was quite dubious about it, and my dubiety has increased ever since the treaty has been in existence. The treaty was ratified in the manner prescribed by the Constitution. The obligation must be discharged.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. KEM. Is $76,000,000 the loss for 1 year?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is the loss for 1 year. The country will have to face a similar loss for many years to come. In fact, we shall face that kind of loss during the entire life of the treaty. That might as well be realized. That is the fact.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is always important that the people who must provide the funds should finally understand what the operation is all about. As I understand, we have been buying wheat, we have been selling the wheat, and we have been taking a loss. As the testimony indicated before the committee, the loss was 59 cents a bushel on the average.

I am wondering whether the American people know how the arrangement operates. In effect, it is another subsidy, aggregating $76,000,000 a year, and the amount might be higher in another year. At least we ought to be frank about it. It is astonishing how it is possible that there should come before the Senate a provision for the cancellation of notes owing by the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Treasury Department. On

its face the language means nothing to the country. It means nothing to the Senate and to the House of Representatives, unless the details are spelled out.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Illinois need not reproach me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No.

Mr. RUSSELL. Because there has always been the habit in Congress for a number of years to do just what is now proposed. If I am not mistaken, the habit started in the House Committee on Agriculture at the time when the distinguished Senator from Illinois was a member of the committee. They started the cancellation of evidences of indebtedness, rather than making appropriations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We had no wheat agreement at the time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I mean with respect to the general losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Appropriations were not made. Notes were canceled. That policy was followed right along. I am not objecting to making an appropriation, because I am trying to be realistic. It will cost $76,800,000 whether we cancel the notes or make an appropriation. I have endeavored to comply with the objections which were made. Apparently it is impossible to meet all objections with respect to the modus operandi in discharging the obligation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Let us first find out how much time is available for debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia has 7 minutes remaining. The Senator from Nebraska has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations I should like to say to the Senator from Georgia that I agree with what the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has said. I believe an appropriation should be made. However, I hope the Committee on Appropriations, particularly the Subcommittee on Agriculture, will have an opportunity to gain a little more knowledge of the subject. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Georgia to the hearings held by the committee. On the subject under discussion less than a page of testimony was taken. It consists mostly of conversation between the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. The last words are:

Senator RUSSELL. I will have to check into it a little more closely, then.

I hope the Senator from Georgia will be willing to adopt the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire and let the matter go over for a supplemental appropriation.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senate can vote the amendment down, if it desires. The Members of the Senate on the other side of the aisle may have the votes to do so. So far as I am concerned, I want to reach a conclusion on it now. It is all right with me if the amendment is defeated. I shall not withdraw the amendment.

Why we should have lengthy hearings in the committee on this item is beyond my comprehension. We are obligated for 135,000,000 bushels of wheat under the treaty. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] knew that when he voted for ratification of the treaty. He knew there was to be a subsidy consisting of the difference between the world price and the price of acquisition of the wheat by the Commodity Credit Corporation. We could hold hearings from now until kingdom come and the subject would not be illuminated any more than it is now. It is purely a mathematical matter of computing the difference between the domestic price of 135,000,000 bushels and the world price, at which we sell it under the treaty. The objections which are being raised now should have been raised when the international wheat agreement was before the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not question the fact that I knew there would be losses. Like everyone else, I did not know what the size of the losses would be. However, it seems to me that if we could have some hearings we could question the officials of the Department of Agriculture with respect to the estimated losses. It seems to me that is the function of the Committee on Appropriations. We may wish to repeal the agreement.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know how the Senator from Massachusetts could get from under the agreement in less than 20 years. It is impossible to repeal a treaty unilaterally. When we enter into an international agreement, we are in it. We cannot get out of it until a stipulated time. It is written in the bond: Twenty years. We are in the agreement for 20 years. We will have to make the losses good every year during the 20 years. They will have to be made good whether the Senate votes for the amendment or not.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The only thing I am asking, as one member of the committee, is that a little more opportunity be afforded to study the matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. For my part, I cannot even assure the Senator from Massachusetts that before the end of the 20 years we will go into any long hearings on the subject, because it is a matter which will have to follow the same pattern every year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I hope the Senator from Georgia will be here for another 18 years. I have great confidence in him.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate the Senator's expression of confidence. I hope my constituents, who have a great regard for the Senator from Massachusetts, will know that he has made such a statement, and will be very much persuaded by it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to make a suggestion, if I may. Why can we not pay all these losses 20 years from now at one time? [Laughter.]

Mr. RUSSELL. That would be a very happy procedure to be adopted. There is no way of wishing away debts. I wish it were possible to do so, because in my youth I was always trying to wish them away. It is necessary to take out of Commodity Credit Corporation funds $76,000,000 this year, and similar funds next year. If we were to follow the suggestion of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] there would not be any money left to pay any money to the farmers of North Dakota.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. When the Senator from North Dakota made his suggestion, there was considerable laughter in the Chamber. However, that is exactly what we will have to do. We will have to borrow the money to pay off the debt.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. I hope the amendment will be agreed to. The debt must be paid off somehow, somewhere.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not rise to discuss the merits of the amendment. I was certainly not discussing the merits of it when I asked the Chair whether the amendment was germane. As I understand, the House eliminated the provision on a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; the House committee recommended it as a legislative proposal—in other words, to cancel that many of the notes of the Commodity Credit Corporation. There was evidently some disciple of the Senator from Delaware in the House of Representatives, and he knew that provision was subject to a point of order, and evidently he approved of the theory that it would be better to handle this matter by way of an appropriation. So the House knocked out the amendment, and did not handle this matter in that form.

Mr. WHERRY. On the side slip we find this statement, which I think is in accordance with what the Senator has said, and also is in support of the position I have taken:

The language recommended in the House was deleted on a point of order which was made in the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is what I said.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, and that is what I said. In other words the amendment was knocked out on a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. So the Senator from Georgia and I are together so far.

The matter now has come to the Senate, and because this item was not added to the appropriation bill in the House, as a legislative item, and because there was a desire to reinstate the item when the bill was before the Senate, the committee has authorized the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee to offer this item as legislation on an appropriation bill. I am in full accord with that.

Now a point of order has been made against the amendment; the point of

order has been made by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. I suppose the distinguished Senator would have continued the debate, and we would have had a vote on the point of order; but at that point some Senator suggested that if this item were offered as a straight appropriation, he would be glad to have it threshed out on the floor of the Senate, either now or later, and then voted on.

So immediately I arose and asked whether the amendment is germane to the pending bill. I cannot understand how we can shift from a legislative proposal which is not in order on an appropriation bill to a direct appropriation, without raising the question of germaneness or at least the question of the propriety of having the committee consider this matter, because although I admit that under the wheat agreement we have to pay for these losses——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, let me ask what plan the Senator from Nebraska has.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator from Georgia to let me proceed for a minute, please. First, I should like to know how the Senator from Georgia can shift from a legislative proposal on an appropriation bill, which requires the suspension of the rule, to a direct appropriation.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do it in my right as a Senator of the United States, duly accredited from the State of Georgia, Mr. President.

Mr. WHERRY. That does not answer my question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I offered it as a legislative provision, to begin with, because it had been handled in that way in the past. However, it could have been handled just as well as a simple appropriation item, at any stage of the proceedings.

Mr. WHERRY. Then why did not the Senator from Georgia handle the matter in that way in the first place?

Mr. RUSSELL. I tried to handle it in that way.

Mr. WHERRY. I mean, why did not it come to us as a direct appropriation, from the committee?

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot answer that.

Mr. WHERRY. The committee is the place where the matter should have been handled as a direct appropriation, if it was to be handled in that way.

Mr. RUSSELL. That may be the opinion of the Senator from Nebraska, but I am within my rights in this connection.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not questioning the rights of the Senator from Georgia. No Member of the Senate knows his rights better than does the Senator from Georgia. However, that is not the point.

The point is that because the Senator from Georgia knows he is within his rights, he has shifted from handling the matter as a legislative amendment to an appropriation bill, which requires a suspension of the rule, to a direct appropriation. Perhaps this item might be germane to page 52 of the bill, where funds are proposed to be made available in order to clear up the indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

However, it seems to me that in all fairness—and I certainly have great respect for the Senator from Georgia, and I can join with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] in expressing the hope that the Senator from Georgia will be in the Senate for many years to come, including the 18 years the Senator from Massachusetts mentioned; and I know that the Senator from Georgia is a very able Senator——

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. However, if this item should be handled as a direct appropriation, it should have originated as such in the committee, rather than as a legislative proposal to the appropriation bill, and then, in one moment, have that procedure abandoned, and have the matter presented as a direct appropriation, without having the members of the committee pass on the matter.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say that the international wheat agreement will run for only 5 years, and it contains plenty of escape clauses in the event that any nation which is a participant finds it too costly or inexpedient.

My only thought is that probably this item belongs in the appropriation bill for the State Department, rather than in the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not see how in the world this item could be added to the State Department appropriation bill, when the Department of Agriculture is making these payments.

Mr. AIKEN. That depends on whether we consider this item from the standpoint of payments received by foreign countries or from the standpoint of payments made by the Department of Agriculture for the wheat.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont will examine the escape clauses to which he has referred, I shall be very glad to be informed how we can escape through some of those clauses and can get out from under this obligation, because we shall be compelled to pay the $76,800,000 for a long time. This matter could run for as long as 20 years.

Mr. AIKEN. It will be ended in 5 years, anyway.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I wish to ask whether the Senator from Georgia thinks the escape clauses should be considered in the committee, before the appropriation is made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired; therefore, he cannot yield any further time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I believe I have a few minutes remaining, and I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri. I now yield to him.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia whether he thinks this entire matter in regard to the question of escape clauses should be examined in his committee before the appropriation is made on the floor of the Senate. Is not that a matter which should properly be inquired into before we make an appropriation of an additional $76,800,000?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, after a man has completed his term in the penitentiary, there is no way by which he can escape from the time he has already served in the penitentiary. We have been in this agreement a year; and all the escape clauses which can be referred to cannot help us escape from making the appropriation in accordance with the obligation we already have incurred.

Mr. KEM. But when we are considering making the treaty for an additional period, is that not the time to consider this matter?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is up to the Foreign Relations Committee, and I shall be very happy to see it consider the matter.

However, inasmuch as the Appropriations Committee is not a legislative committee, it cannot go into the matter of the escape clauses.

Mr. KEM. Cannot the Appropriations Committee make a recommendation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I just made my recommendation. If the Senator from Missouri did me the honor of listening to me, he heard me make it.

Mr. KEM. I listened to the Senator from Georgia, but I hope he will permit me to say that I think a recommendation on the part of his committee would at least have more weight.

Mr. RUSSELL. In the future such legislative matters can be handled by the proper legislative committee. Certainly all Members of the Senate, including the members of the Foreign Relations Committee, should be aware of the situation, after the discussion which has occurred here this afternoon.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. WHERRY. In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to say that if there is to be any future escape, I hope the escape occurs through the Senate Appropriations Committee, so that we shall have a chance to see what these appropriations are. That is the only point I am making.

I certainly thought that when this matter was submitted to the Senate, it would come as a legislative proposal to an appropriation bill, and I thought that would be the time for us to discuss the item. I think that is the reason why it was handled in that way.

I should like to have the rules of the Senate observed. I am satisfied that if this situation had arisen in some way in connection with a measure pertaining to legislation in another field, the Senator from Georgia would have been the first Member of the Senate on his feet, seeking to have the item go back to his committee for its direct consideration.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course the Senator from Nebraska knows that it is six of one and a half dozen of the other, but in any case the amount involved is $76,800,000.

If the taxpayers have to pay that amount, they do not care whether they pay it by cancelling the notes or by making an appropriation item out of it.

So, it seems to me that we are splitting hairs rather thin if we are to argue concerning the source of the payment or the method of making the payment.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not arguing that. I maintain, as I said to the Senator from Georgia, that if it was necessary in the first instance to suspend the rule in order that this legislative proposal might be submitted as an amendment to an appropriaiton bill, but if the matter is now to be considered as a direct appropriation, it should be brought up in that form in the committee. I realize that in the final analysis the cost will be the same; it will be $76,800,000. If this item could have been handled as a direct appropriation in the first place, it should have been handled in that way. However, it came up in the other way; but now on the floor of the Senate it has been decided not to proceed with this item by way of offering it as a legislative amendment to the appropriation bill, and in that connection to seek to have the rule suspended, but to handle this matter as a direct appropriation. In my opinion, if the latter course were followed now, the result would be to bypass the committee which should consider, as a legislative question, whether the payment should be made by means of canceling the notes of the indebtedness on the part of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield, if I have any time left.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say to the Senator that I have in front of me a copy of the International Wheat Agreement of 1949, with the report of the committee, and the appendixes. From page 9 of the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations on the International Wheat Agreement of 1949, under the heading "Appendixes," on page 9, I read, in part only, question 4:

> Some have said it would mean a minimum yearly subsidy of $74,000,000 a year and that it could go to $240,000,000.

I shall not read the entire question. Included in the answer to question 4 is the following statement:

> It is anticipated that a maximum subsidy of $84,000,000 will be required in the first year of the agreement but that the need for a subsidy will decline or disappear in the latter years.

The agreement is to last for 4 or 5 years. There are certain ways of getting out of it, if that should be deemed wise. It seems to me, I may say to the Senator from Nebraska, that all those points make it advisable that the Committee on Appropriations conduct more extended hearings, in order that we may know more about it, rather than dumping this first year's subsidy abruptly onto the floor of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his observation. It is the point I have been trying to make in raising the question of germaneness. I hope the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee will do what is suggested. I do not question that the amount will be paid.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to know how it is proposed to pay it, if we are not willing to appropriate for it, and are not willing to cancel the notes.

Mr. WHERRY. Let us take it back to the committee and have a few hearings on it. Let us see what members of the committee think about it. Let us get the recommendations of the committee as to including it in some other bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is a statement in the House hearings which gives, to the last dollar, what each nation has received by way of benefit from the agreement, and the hearings are not going to have anything to do with that. I am not going to ask for a yea-and-nay vote. If the Senate wants to vote the amendment down, it may do so.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not think the Senate wants to vote down the $76,000,000. That is not the point. This is not a case of a committee complaining because it was bypassed. This is not parallel to the situation which was before the Senate a little while ago. I think the committee should have had further hearings and should have reported a separate appropriation. I admit that, in the end, the money will probably be paid, and I may say to the Senator from Georgia, my friend, for whom I have great respect, that delay will not make any difference so far as the dollars are concerned.

Mr. RUSSELL. I want to say to my friend, for whom I have the greatest affection and high regard, I think he is overtechnical on this item. Payment will be required, and I am constrained to request a vote on the amendment. I understand that that is entirely within the purview of the committee action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All time for debate has expired. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

On a division the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, may I inquire of Senators how many more amendments are to be proposed?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have one amendment which I should like to offer.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have one.

Mr. BYRD. I have one.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, with three amendments to be offered, I do not think there is a chance of finishing the bill tonight.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield, that I may send an amendment to the desk?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator offer the amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and will lie on the table.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the unanimous-consent agreement makes House bill 3282, the Treasury and Post Office Departments Appropriation Act, 1952, the unfinished business, immediately following the disposition of the pending bill. There is a limitation of debate upon that bill. I hope every Senator will be present promptly tomorrow, and that we may be able to dispose of it expeditiously.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. It seems to me that those of us who really wish to address the Senate briefly should have an opportunity of doing so before the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill is taken up. We have no objection to the limitation, although we were not present when the unanimous-consent agreement was effected; but we do think there ought to be a short period of time in which we might place matters in the RECORD and make 5- or 10-minute presentations to the Senate, before the Senate proceeds to the consideration of the Post Office and Treasury appropriation bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. I may say to my good friend that I am hopeful we can finish that bill tomorrow. On Friday, as the hours grow later, it will be harder to keep Senators on the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. I realize that.

Mr. McFARLAND. I would rather they would wait until after we finish. Tomorrow will be Friday. That is why I should like to finish the bill tomorrow. I should like to dispose of both appropriation bills tomorrow, if possible.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have matters which must be taken up because of the running of time.

Mr. McFARLAND. I know what the Senator has in mind. They would be matters of business, not merely speeches, and we might be able to dispose of them. They would involve the transaction of business. I shall be glad to confer with the Senator about them.

Mr. McCARRAN. There may be some speeches in connection with them.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not think there will be many speeches. But I shall confer with the Senator. I think we might arrange with him to dispose of the resolution about which he has spoken to me. I know what he has in mind.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, July 27, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate July 26 (legislative day of July 24), 1951:

IN THE ARMY

Col. John D. Billingsley, O17188, for appointment as professor of ordnance, United States Military Academy, under the provisions of Public Law 449, Seventy-ninth Congress, and section 520 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 27, 1951

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

TITLE I—REGULAR ACTIVITIES

RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946

To enable the Secretary to improve and develop, independently or through cooperation among Federal and

1 State agencies, and others, a sound and efficient system for
2 the distribution and marketing of agricultural products under
3 the provisions of titles II and III of the Act of August 14,
4 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1621–1629), (1)~~$4,700,000~~
5 *$4,850,000*: *Provided,* That not less than $600,000 of this
6 amount shall be available for contracts in accordance with
7 the provisions of section 205 of said Act: *Provided further,*
8 That the Secretary may make available to any bureau,
9 office, or agency of the Department such amounts
10 from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry
11 out the functions for which it is made (but amounts
12 made available to the Office of the Secretary, Office of the
13 Solicitor, and Office of Information, shall not exceed those
14 which the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon
15 with representatives of the Department, shall determine),
16 and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts trans-
17 ferred or otherwise made available to other appropriation
18 items of the Department: *Provided further,* That no part
19 of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to
20 fish or shellfish or any product thereof, except for the sup-
21 port of equitable transportation rates before Federal agen-
22 cies concerned with such rates and for development of foreign
23 markets.

1 BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

2 For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of
3 the Act establishing the Bureau of Agricultural Economics
4 (7 U. S. C. 411) and related Acts, as follows:

5 Economic investigations: For conducting investigations
6 and for acquiring and diffusing useful information among the
7 people of the United States, relative to agricultural pro-
8 duction, distribution, land utilization, and conservation in
9 their broadest aspects, including farm management and prac-
10 tice, utilization of farm and food products, purchasing of farm
11 supplies, farm population and rural life, farm labor, farm
12 finance, insurance and taxation, adjustments in production
13 to probable demand for the different farm and food products;
14 land ownership and values, costs, prices and income in their
15 relation to agriculture, including causes for their variations
16 and trends, (2)~~$2,000,000~~ *$2,250,000*: *Provided,* That no
17 part of the funds herein appropriated or made available to the
18 Bureau of Agricultural Economics under the heading "Eco-
19 nomic investigations" shall be used for State and county land-
20 use planning, for conducting cultural surveys, or for the
21 maintenance of regional offices.

22 Crop and livestock estimates: For collecting, compiling,
23 abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and pub-

1 lishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and live-
2 stock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, staples of cotton,
3 stocks, and value of farm crops and numbers, grades, and
4 value of livestock and livestock products on farms, pro-
5 duction, distribution, and consumption of turpentine and
6 rosin pursuant to the Act of August 15, 1935 (5 U. S. C.
7 556b), and for the collection and publication of statistics
8 of peanuts as provided by the Act approved June 24, 1936,
9 as amended May 12, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 951–957),
10 **(3)**~~$2,850,000~~ *$2,848,304*: *Provided,* That no part of the
11 funds herein appropriated shall be available for any expense
12 incident to ascertaining, collating, or publishing a report stat-
13 ing the intention of farmers as to the acreage to be planted in
14 cotton, or for estimates of apple production for other than the
15 commercial crop.

16 AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

17 OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

18 For necessary expenses of the Office of Administrator,
19 including travel and subsistence expenses of advisory com-
20 mittees authorized by title III of the Act of August 14, 1946
21 (7 U. S. C. 1628–1629), and the maintenance, operation,
22 and furnishing of facilities and services at the Agricultural
23 Research Center, **(4)**~~$560,000~~ *$541,440*: *Provided,* That
24 the appropriation current at the time services are rendered
25 may be reimbursed (by advance credits or reimbursements

1 based on estimated or actual charges) from applicable appro-
2 priations, to cover the charges, including handling and other
3 related services, for equipment rentals (including depre-
4 ciation, maintenance, and repairs); for services, supplies,
5 equipment, and material furnished: *Provided further,* That
6 of the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research
7 Administration, not to exceed $15,000 shall be available
8 for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section
9 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as
10 amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
11 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further,* That the several appro-
12 priations of the Agricultural Research Administration shall
13 be available for the construction, alteration, and repair of
14 buildings and improvements: *Provided, however,* That unless
15 otherwise provided, the cost of constructing any one build-
16 ing (excepting headhouses connecting greenhouses and
17 experimental farm houses) shall not exceed $5,000, the
18 total amount for construction of buildings costing more
19 than $2,500 each shall be within the limits of the esti-
20 mates submitted and approved therefor, and the cost of
21 altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not
22 exceed $2,500 or 2 per centum of the cost of the building
23 as certified by the Research Administrator, whichever is
24 greater (5), *except for the alteration of one building at Green-*
25 *field, Massachusetts, at a cost not to exceed $7,500*: *Provided*

further, That not to exceed 7 per centum of the funds of any research appropriation of the Agricultural Research Administration, including the appropriation for the Office of the Administrator, may be transferred by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary, to any other such research appropriation in order to provide for a more effective research program: *Provided, however*, That no appropriation may be increased more than 7 per centum by such transfers.

RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to conduct research into the basic agricultural needs and problems of the Territory of Alaska, through such agencies of the Department as he may designate, independently or in cooperation with appropriate agencies of the Territory of Alaska, (6)~~$250,000~~ *$261,550*.

OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico

For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico to be paid quarterly in advance where applicable, to carry into effect the provisions of the following Acts relating to agricultural experiment stations:

Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U. S. C. 362, 363, 365, 368, 377–379), $720,000; Adams

1 Act, the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369),
2 $720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24,
3 1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373–376, 380, 382),
4 $2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act ap-
5 proved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), sections 3
6 and 5, $2,863,708, and sections 9 and 11 of said Act as
7 added by the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427h,
8 427j), including administration by the Office of Experi-
9 ment Stations in the United States Department of Agri-
10 culture, $5,000,000, no part of which latter amount shall
11 be used for beginning construction of any building costing
12 in excess of $15,000, except that a poultry breeding house
13 may be constructed at Purdue University at a cost to this
14 appropriation of not to exceed $29,000; Hawaii, the Act
15 approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386–386b), extending
16 the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to the Territory of
17 Hawaii, $90,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23,
18 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Hatch
19 Act to the Territory of Alaska, $15,000, and the provisions
20 of section 2 of the Act approved June 20, 1936, as amended
21 (7 U. S. C. 369a, Public Law 739, approved August 29,
22 1950), extending the benefits of the Adams and Purnell
23 Acts to the Territory of Alaska, (7) ~~$37,500~~ *$52,500*; Puerto
24 Rico, the Act approved March 4, 1931, as amended (7
25 U. S. C. 386d–386f), extending the benefits of certain Acts

of Congress to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, (8)~~$12,416,208~~ *$12,431,208.*

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses in connection with administration of grants and coordination of research with States pursuant to the Acts approved March 2, 1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May 16, 1928, February 23, 1929, March 4, 1931, and June 20, 1936, and Acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361–363, 365–383, 386–386f), and title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended by the Act of September 21, 1944 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), and for the administration, operation, and maintenance of an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, (9)~~$390,000~~ *$367,090*; and the Secretary shall prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required under the above Acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the research work of the State agricultural colleges and experiment stations in the lines authorized in said Acts with research of the Department in similar lines, and make report thereon to Congress.

BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

For necessary expenses in connection with conducting investigations of the relative utility and economy of agricultural products for food, clothing, and other uses in the

1 home, with special suggestions of plans and methods for
2 the more effective utilization of such products for these
3 purposes, and such economic investigations, including
4 housing and household buying, as have for their purpose
5 the improvement of the rural home, for coordinating nutri-
6 tion services made available by Federal, State, and other
7 agencies, and for disseminating useful information on these
8 subjects, $1,350,000.

9 BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

10 Salaries and Expenses

11 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
12 the Act, as amended, establishing a Bureau of Animal
13 Industry, and related Acts, and for investigation concerned
14 with the livestock and meat industries and the domestic
15 raising of fur-bearing animals, as follows:

16 Animal research: For animal husbandry investigations;
17 investigations of diseases of animals and of tuberculin,
18 serums, antitoxins, and analogous products; and cooperation
19 in the administration of regulations for the improvement of
20 poultry, poultry products, and hatcheries, as authorized by
21 law (7 U. S. C. 429, Public Law 662, approved August 4,
22 1950); (10)~~$3,200,700~~ *$3,320,700.*

23 Animal disease control and eradication: For the control
24 and eradication of tuberculosis and paratuberculosis of ani-

1 mals, avian turberculosis, Bang's disease of cattle, scabies
2 in sheep and cattle, southern cattle ticks, hog cholera and
3 related swine diseases, and dourine in horses, and other
4 inspection and quarantine work authorized by law; for
5 supervision of the transportation of livestock, including
6 administration of the twenty-eight-hour law; for inspection
7 of vessels; and for carrying out the provisions of the Act
8 of March 4, 1913 (21 U. S. C. 151–158), relating to
9 veterinary biological products, (11) ~~$7,750,000~~ *$7,731,022,*
10 including $30,000 for the acquisition of land and construction
11 of buildings for inspection of livestock at Canadian border
12 ports of entry: *Provided,* That no payment hereunder as
13 compensation for any cattle condemned for slaughter for
14 tuberculosis, paratuberculosis, or Bang's disease shall exceed
15 (1) $25 for any grade animal or $50 for any pure bred
16 animal, (2) one-third of the difference between the appraised
17 value and the value of salvage thereof, or (3) the amount paid
18 or to be paid by the State or other cooperating agency,
19 and no payment hereunder shall be made for any animal
20 if at the time of test or condemnation it shall belong
21 to or be upon the premises of any person, firm, or corpora-
22 tion to which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered for
23 slaughter.

24 Marketing agreements, hog cholera virus and serum:
25 For carrying into effect sections 56 to 60, inclusive, of the

Act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 851–855) regulating the marketing of anti-hog-cholera serum and hog-cholera virus, (12)~~$49,300~~ *$47,906*.

Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of laws relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat-food products, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only $12,800,000 (13)~~: *Provided,* That hereafter reimbursement may be made by any person, firm, or organization for the expenses of meat inspection in excess of those which can be met from the amount appropriated for such purpose of each year~~.

BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Act of May 29, 1924 (7 U. S. C. 401–404), including investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in dairy industry, the applicable provisions of the Act of May 9, 1902 (26 U. S. C. 2325, 2326 (c)), relating to process or renovated butter, as amended, and the Act of May 23, 1908 (21 U. S. C. 94 (a)), insofar as it relates to the exportation of process or renovated butter, (14)~~$1,450,000~~ *$1,491,000*.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments, and demonstrations established under the provisions of section 202 (a) to 202 (e), inclusive, of title II of the Agri-

1 cultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1292); for the
2 development of new and extended food, feed, and industrial
3 uses for agricultural commodities, both plant and animal,
4 and potential replacement crops, and processing, biological,
5 chemical, physical, pharmacological, toxicological, and tech-
6 nological investigation thereof, (15)~~$7,200,000~~ *$7,300,000.*

7 BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL
8 ENGINEERING

9 Plant, soil, and agricultural engineering research: For
10 expenses necessary for investigations, experiments, and dem-
11 onstrations concerning plants, soils, and agricultural engi-
12 neering, including those related to the production, improve-
13 ment, handling, processing, transportation, and storage of
14 farm and other crops; control of weeds, plant diseases, and
15 nematodes; discovery and introduction of new and useful
16 plants, both foreign and native; soil and water management
17 to improve soil productivity; the relation of soils to plant,
18 animal, and human nutrition; classification and mapping of
19 soils; fertilizers, liming materials, and soil amendments;
20 farm machinery and processing equipment; farm buildings,
21 and farm electrification; and for the operation and mainte-
22 nance of airplanes; (16)~~$10,351,400~~ *$10,589,730* (17), *in-*
23 *cluding not to exceed $275,000 for the construction of a*
24 *laboratory at Orlando, Florida.*

25 National Arboretum: For the maintenance and develop-

1 ment of the National Arboretum established under the pro-
2 visions of the Act approved March 4, 1927 (20 U. S. C.
3 191–194, (18)~~$148,600~~ *$136,920.*

4 BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

5 Salaries and Expenses

6 For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments,
7 demonstrations, and surveys for the promotion of economic
8 entomology, for investigating and ascertaining the best
9 means of destroying insects and related pests injurious to
10 agriculture, for importing useful and beneficial insects and
11 bacterial, fungal, and other diseases of insects and related
12 pests, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of
13 destroying insects affecting man and animals, and the best
14 ways of utilizing beneficial insects, for carrying into effect
15 the provisions of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20,
16 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), the Honey Bee
17 Act (7 U. S. C. 281–283), the Insect Pest Act (7 U. S. C.
18 141–144), the Mexican Border Act (7 U. S. C. 149), and
19 the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), as amended,
20 authorizing the eradication, control, and prevention of spread
21 of injurious insects and plant pests; including the operation
22 and maintenance of airplanes and the purchase of not to
23 exceed two, as follows:

24 Insect investigations: For the investigation of insects
25 affecting fruits, grapes, nuts, trees, shrubs, forests and forest

1 products, truck and garden crops, cereal, forage and range
2 crops, cotton, tobacco, sugar plants, ornamental and other
3 plants and agricultural products, household possessions, and
4 man and animals; for bee culture and apiary management;
5 for classifying, identifying, and collecting information to de-
6 termine the distribution and abundance of insects; for inves-
7 tigations in connection with introduction of natural enemies
8 of injurious insects and related pests and for the exchange
9 with other countries of useful and beneficial insects and other
10 arthropods; for developing methods, equipment, and appa-
11 ratus to aid in enforcing plant quarantines and in the eradica-
12 tion and control of insect pests and plant diseases; and for
13 investigations of insecticides and fungicides, including meth-
14 ods of their manufacture and use and the effects of their
15 application, (19) ~~$3,525,000~~ *$3,797,725*: *Provided,* That of
16 the amount allotted for oriental fruitfly, not to exceed
17 $250,000 may be used for contracts with public or private
18 agencies for research in accordance with section 10 (a) of
19 the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427i), and the
20 amounts obligated for contract research shall remain available
21 until expended.

22 Insect and plant-disease control: For carrying out
23 operations or measures to eradicate, suppress, control, or to
24 prevent or retard the spread of Japanese beetle, sweetpotato
25 weevil, Mexican fruitflies, phony peach and peach mosaic,

1 cereal rusts, pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil, golden
2 nematode, citrus blackfly, white-fringed beetle, Hall scale,
3 and gypsy and brown-tail moths, including the enforce-
4 ment of quarantine regulations and cooperation with States
5 to enforce plant quarantines as authorized by the Plant
6 Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7
7 U. S. C. 151–167), and including the establishment of
8 such cotton-free areas as may be necessary to stamp out
9 any infestation of the pink bollworm as authorized by the
10 Act of February 8, 1930 (46 Stat. 67), and for cooperation
11 with States in the compensation of growers for losses result-
12 ing from the destruction of or for not planting potatoes and
13 tomatoes on lands infested or exposed to infestations of the
14 golden nematode for the purpose authorized by the Golden
15 Nematode Act (Public Law 645, approved June 15, 1948),
16 (20)~~$4,500,000~~ *$4,716,062*: *Provided,* That no part of this
17 appropriation shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees,
18 farm animals, farm crops, or other property injured or de-
19 stroyed, except potatoes and tomatoes as authorized under
20 the Golden Nematode Act: *Provided further,* That, in
21 the discretion of the Secretary, no part of this appro-
22 priation shall be expended for the control of sweet-
23 potato weevil in any State until such State has provided
24 cooperation necessary to accomplish this purpose, or for
25 barberry eradication until a sum or sums at least equal to

1 such expenditures shall have been appropriated, subscribed,
2 or contributed by States, counties, or local authorities, or
3 by individuals or organizations for the accomplishment of
4 this purpose, or with respect to the golden nematode except
5 as prescribed in section 4 of the Golden Nematode Act.

6 Plant quarantines: For operations against the in-
7 troduction of insect pests or plant diseases into the
8 United States, including the enforcement of foreign-
9 plant quarantines and regulations promulgated under sections
10 5 and 7 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912,
11 as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), the Insect Pest Act of
12 1905 (7 U. S. C. 141–144), and the Mexican Border Act
13 of 1942 (7 U. S. C. 149), for enforcement of domestic-
14 plant quarantines as they pertain to Territories and districts
15 of the United States, for the enforcement of plant quarantines
16 through inspection in transit, including the interception and
17 disposition of materials found to have been transported in
18 violation of Federal plant quarantine laws or regulations, and
19 operations under the Terminal Inspection Act (7 U. S. C.
20 166) and enforcement of regulations governing the move-
21 ment of plants into and from the District of Columbia
22 promulgated under section 15 of the Plant Quarantine Act
23 of August 20, 1912, as amended, and for inspection and
24 certification of plants and plant products to meet the sani-
25 tary requirements of foreign countries, as authorized in sec-

1 tion 102 of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a),
2 $2,600,000.

3 Control of Emergency Outbreaks of Insects and Plant
4 Diseases

5 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
6 the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C.
7 148–148e), including the operation and maintenance of air-
8 planes and the purchase of not to exceed two, and surveys
9 and control operations in Canada in cooperation with the
10 Canadian Government or local Canadian authorities, and
11 the employment of Canadian citizens, $1,800,000, of which
12 $1,000,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section
13 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, for the purposes
14 of said joint resolution only to the extent that the Secretary,
15 with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds neces-
16 sary to meet emergency conditions.

17 Control of Forest Pests

18 For expenses necessary for carrying out operations,
19 measures, or surveys necessary to eradicate, suppress, con-
20 trol, or to prevent or retard the spread of insects or diseases
21 which endanger forest trees on any lands in the United
22 States, and for such quarantine measures relating thereto
23 as may be necessary pursuant to the Plant Quarantine Act
24 of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167),

1 including the purchase (not to exceed two) and operation
2 and maintenance of airplanes, and construction and alteration
3 of necessary buildings: *Provided,* That the cost of construct-
4 ing or altering any one building during the fiscal year shall
5 not exceed $2,500, as follows:

6 Forest Pest Control Act: For carrying out the provi-
7 sions of the Act approved June 25, 1947 (16 U. S. C., Supp.
8 I, 594-1—594-5), (21)~~$1,700,000~~ *$3,600,000,* of which
9 $500,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section
10 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, for the purposes
11 of said Act only to the extent that the Secretary, with the
12 approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to
13 meet emergency conditions.

14 White pine blister rust: White pine blister rust, pur-
15 suant to the Act of April 26, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 594a),
16 $3,300,000, of which $505,000 shall be available to the
17 Department of the Interior for the control of white pine
18 blister rust on or endangering Federal lands under the
19 jurisdiction of that Department or lands of Indian tribes
20 which are under the jurisdiction of or retained under re-
21 strictions of the United States; $1,750,000 to the Forest
22 Service for the control of white pine blister rust on or endan-
23 gering lands under its jurisdiction; and $1,045,000 to the
24 Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine for leadership
25 and general coordination of the entire program, method de-

1 velopment, and for operations conducted under its direction
2 for such control, including, but not confined to, the control of
3 white pine blister rust on or endangering State and privately
4 owned lands.

5 FOREST SERVICE

6 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

7 For expenses necessary, including not to exceed $10,000
8 for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section
9 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as
10 amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
11 (5 U. S. C. 55a); to experiment and make investigations
12 and report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and lum-
13 bering, but no part of this appropriation shall be used for
14 any experiment or test made outside the jurisdiction of the
15 United States; to advise the owners of woodlands as to
16 the proper care of the same; to investigate and test Amer-
17 ican timber and timber trees and their uses, and methods
18 for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek, through
19 investigations and the planting of native and foreign spe-
20 cies, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to erect neces-
21 sary buildings: *Provided,* That the cost of any building pur-
22 chased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost (not
23 to exceed $1,000) of constructing a water-supply or sani-
24 tary system and of connecting the same with any such
25 building, and exclusive of the cost of any tower upon which

1 a lookout house may be erected, shall not exceed $15,000,
2 with the exception that any building erected, purchased,
3 or acquired, the cost of which was $15,000 or more, may
4 be improved out of the appropriations made under this
5 Act for the Forest Service by an amount not to exceed 2
6 per centum of the cost of such building as certified by the
7 Chief of the Forest Service; to protect, administer, and
8 improve the national forests, including tree planting
9 and other measures to prevent erosion, drift, surface
10 wash, soil waste, and the formation of floods, and to con-
11 serve water; to ascertain the natural conditions upon and
12 utilize the national forests, to transport and care for fish
13 and game supplied to stock the national forests or the waters
14 therein; to collate, digest, report, and illustrate the results
15 of experiments and investigations made by the Forest Serv-
16 ice, as follows:

17 National forest protection and management: For the
18 administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement,
19 and development of the national forests, including the estab-
20 lishment and maintenance of forest tree nurseries, includ-
21 ing the procurement of tree seed and nursery stock by
22 purchase, production, or otherwise, seeding and tree plant-
23 ing and the care of plantations and young growth; the
24 operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of
25 not to exceed three; the maintenance of roads and trails

1 and the construction and maintenance of all other improve-
2 ments necessary for the proper and economical adminis-
3 tration, protection, development, and use of the national
4 forests, including experimental areas under Forest Service
5 administration, except that where direct purchases will be
6 more economical than construction, improvements may be
7 purchased; the construction (not to exceed $15,000 for
8 any one structure), equipment, and maintenance of sani-
9 tary and recreational facilities; timber cultural operations;
10 development and application of fish and game management
11 plans; propagation and transplanting of plants suitable for
12 planting on semiarid portions of the national forests; esti-
13 mating and appraising of timber and other resources and
14 development and application of plans for their effective
15 management, sale, and use; expenses of the National Forest
16 Reservation Commission as authorized by section 14 of the
17 Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 514); examination,
18 classification, surveying, and appraisal of land incident to
19 effecting exchanges authorized by law and of lands within
20 the boundaries of the national forests that may be opened
21 to homestead settlement and entry under the Act of June 11,
22 1906, and the Act of August 10, 1912 (16 U. S. C. 506–
23 509), as provided by the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C.
24 512); investigation and establishment of water rights, in-
25 cluding the purchase thereof or of lands or interests in lands

1 or rights-of-way for use and protection of water rights neces-
2 sary or beneficial in connection with the administration and
3 public use of the national forests; and all expenses necessary
4 for the use, maintenance, improvement, protection, and gen-
5 eral administration of the national forests, (22)~~$27,122,025~~
6 *$27,522,025*, of which not to exceed $75,000 shall be avail-
7 able for the purchase of three nursery sites.

8 Fighting forest fires: For fighting and preventing forest
9 fires on or threatening lands under Forest Service adminis-
10 tration, including lands under contract for purchase or in
11 process of condemnation for Forest Service purposes, and
12 for liquidation of obligations incurred in the preceding fiscal
13 year for such purpose, $6,000,000, of which $2,500,000
14 shall be apportioned for use, pursuant to section 3679 of the
15 Revised Statutes, as amended, only to the extent that the
16 Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget,
17 finds necessary to meet emergency conditions.

18 Forest research: For forest research at forest or range
19 experiment stations, the Forest Products Laboratory, or else-
20 where, in accordance with the provisions of sections 1, 2,
21 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the Act approved May 22, 1928, as
22 amended (16 U. S. C. 581, 581a, 581f–581i), including
23 the construction and maintenance of improvements; fire,
24 silvicultural, watershed, and other forest investigations and
25 experiments; investigations and experiments to develop im-

1 proved methods of management of forest and other ranges;
2 experiments, investigations, and tests of forest products; a
3 comprehensive forest survey; and investigations in forest
4 economics; (23)~~$5,220,500~~ *$5,108,603*: *Provided,* That
5 hereafter funds may be received from any State, other polit-
6 ical subdivision, organization, or individual for the purpose of
7 establishing or operating any forest research facility located
8 within the United States, its Territories, or possessions.

9 FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

10 For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions
11 of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act approved No-
12 vember 9, 1921, as amended (23 U. S. C. 23, 23a), re-
13 lating to forest development roads and trails, including the
14 construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of roads and
15 trails on experimental areas under Forest Service administra-
16 tion, (24)~~$11,500,000~~ *$14,500,000*, which sum is authorized
17 to be appropriated by the Acts of June 29, 1948 (Public
18 Law 834), and September 7, 1950 (Public Law 769),
19 to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That
20 this appropriation shall be available for the rental, purchase,
21 construction, or alteration of buildings necessary for the
22 storage and repair of equipment and supplies used for road
23 and trail construction and maintenance, but the total cost
24 of any such building purchased, altered, or constructed under
25 this authorization shall not exceed $15,000 with the excep-

1 tion that any building erected, purchased, or acquired, the
2 cost of which was $15,000 or more, may be improved
3 within any fiscal year by an amount not to exceed 2 per
4 centum of the cost of such buildings certified by the Chief of
5 the Forest Service.

6 ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

7 Weeks Act

8 For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions
9 of the Act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16
10 U. S. C. 513–519, 521), (25)~~$50,000~~ *$100,000*, to be
11 available only for payment toward the purchase price of any
12 lands acquired, including the cost of surveys in con-
13 nection with such acquisition: *Provided,* That no part of
14 such funds shall be used for the purchase of lands in the
15 counties of Adair, Cherokee, and Sequoyah, in the State
16 of Oklahoma, without the specific approval of the Board
17 of County Commissioners of the county in which such lands
18 are situated.

19 Superior National Forest

20 For the acquisition of forest land within the Superior
21 National Forest, Minnesota, under the provisions of the
22 Act approved June 22, 1948 (Public Law 733),
23 (26)~~$100,000~~ *$150,000*, to remain available until expended.

24 Special Acts

25 For the acquisition of land to facilitate the control of

1 soil erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior
2 boundaries of the following national forests, in accordance
3 with the provisions of the following Acts authorizing annual
4 appropriations of forest receipts for such purposes, and in
5 not to exceed the following amounts from such receipts:
6 Uinta and Wasatch National Forests, Utah, Act of August
7 26, 1935 (Public Law 337), as amended, (27)~~$40,000~~
8 *$39,830*; Cache National Forest, Utah, Act of May 11, 1938
9 (Public Law 505), as amended, $10,000; San Bernardino
10 and Cleveland National Forests, Riverside County, Califor-
11 nia, Act of June 15, 1938 (Public Law 634), as amended,
12 $22,000; Nevada and Toiyabe National Forests, Nevada,
13 Act of June 25, 1938 (Public Law 748), as amended,
14 $10,000; Angeles National Forest, California, Act of June
15 11, 1940 (Public Law 591), $20,000; Cleveland National
16 Forest, San Diego County, California, Act of June 11, 1940
17 (Public Law 589), $5,000; Sequoia National Forest,
18 California, Act of June 17, 1940 (Public Law 637),
19 (28)~~$35,000~~ *$34,850*; in all (29)~~$142,000~~ *$141,680*.

20 STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

21 For expenses necessary for cooperation with the various
22 States in forest-fire prevention and suppression, in forest
23 tree planting, in forest management and processing, and in
24 farm forestry extension, pursuant to the Act of August 25,

1950 (Public Law 729), and sections 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the Act of June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 564–568a), and Acts supplementary thereto; advising timberland owners, associations, and other appropriate agencies in the application of forest management principles to federally owned lands leased to States and to private forest lands, and advising wood-using industries in processing of forest products, so as to attain sustained-yield management, the conservation of the timber resources, the productivity of forest lands, and the stabilization of employment and economic continuance of forest industries; $10,750,000.

(30) *COOPERATIVE RANGE IMPROVEMENTS*

For artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious plants on national forests, as authorized by section 12 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (Public Law 478), $700,000, to remain available until expended.

FLOOD CONTROL

For expenses necessary, in accordance with the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law 738), as amended and supplemented, to make preliminary examinations and surveys, and to perform works of improvement, and to plan the agricultural phases of the development of the Columbia Basin area, the Arkansas-White-Red River area, and the New England-New York area, in accordance with

1 the provisions of laws relating to the activities of the
2 Department, including not to exceed $100,000 for em-
3 ployment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a)
4 of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by
5 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), to
6 remain available until expended, (31) ~~$6,112,800~~ *$6,372,800,*
7 with which shall be merged the unexpended balances of funds
8 heretofore appropriated or transferred to the Department for
9 flood-control purposes: *Provided,* That no part of such funds
10 shall be used for the purchase of lands in the Yazoo and
11 Little Tallahatchie watersheds without specific approval of
12 the county board of supervisors of the county in which such
13 lands are situated, nor shall any part of such funds be used
14 for the purchase of lands in the counties of Adair, Cherokee,
15 and Sequoyah, in the State of Oklahoma, without the specific
16 approval of the Board of County Commissioners of the
17 county in which such lands are situated: *Provided fur-*
18 *ther,* That of the funds available herein, not in excess of
19 $6,000,000 (with which shall be merged the unexpended
20 balance of funds heretofore made available for these pur-
21 poses) may be expended in watersheds heretofore author-
22 ized by section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December
23 22, 1944, for necessary gully control, floodwater detention,
24 and floodway structures in areas other than those over
25 which the Department of the Army has jurisdiction and

1 responsibility(32): *Provided further, That not in excess of*
2 *$60,000 of the funds made available herein may be used for*
3 *surveys of the watersheds of the Big Nemaha River, Little*
4 *Nemaha River, and Weeping Water Creek in Nebraska and*
5 *such surveys shall be coordinated with the investigations of*
6 *the Corps of Engineers.*

7 SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

8 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9 For necessary expenses for carrying out the provisions
10 of the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f),
11 title III of the Act of July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010–
12 1012), and the Act of August 11, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 1011
13 note), including research and investigations into the charac-
14 ter, cause, extent, history, and effects of erosion, soil and
15 moisture depletion, and methods of soil and water conserva-
16 tion (including the construction and hydrologic phases of
17 farm irrigation and land drainage, and the construction, oper-
18 ation, and maintenance of experimental watersheds, stations,
19 laboratories, plots, and installations (33)~~and water regu-~~
20 ~~lation to conserve the soil and reduce fire hazards in the~~
21 ~~Everglades region of Florida, except that expenditures for~~
22 ~~all work in the Everglades region shall be limited to a sum~~
23 ~~not in excess of funds made available for such work by the~~
24 ~~State of Florida, or political subdivisions thereof~~); making
25 conservation surveys and plans and establishing measures to

1 conserve soil and water (including farm irrigation and land
2 drainage and such special measures as may be necessary
3 to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs) ; establish-
4 ment and operation of conservation nurseries; development
5 and management of land utilization project lands and facili-
6 ties; dissemination of information; purchase and erection
7 or alteration of permanent buildings; operation and mainte-
8 nance of aircraft; and furnishing of subsistence to employees;
9 (34)~~$54,278,000~~ *$53,474,991*: *Provided,* That the cost of
10 any permanent building purchased, erected, or as improved,
11 exclusive of the cost of constructing a water supply or sanitary
12 system and connecting the same to any such building and with
13 the exception of buildings acquired in conjunction with land
14 being purchased for other purposes, shall not exceed $2,500,
15 except for eight buildings to be constructed or improved at a
16 cost not to exceed $15,000 per building and except that
17 alterations or improvements to other existing permanent
18 buildings costing $2,500 or more may be made in any fiscal
19 year in an amount not to exceed $500 per building: *Provided*
20 *further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be available
21 for the construction of any such building on land not owned
22 by the Government: *Provided further,* That in the State of
23 Missouri, where the State has established a central State
24 agency authorized to enter into agreements with the United
25 States or any of its agencies on policies and general pro-

1 grams for the saving of its soil by the extension of Federal
2 aid to any soil conservation district in such State, the agree-
3 ments made by or on behalf of the United States with any
4 such soil conservation district shall have the prior approval
5 of such central State agency before they shall become effective
6 as to such district: *Provided further,* That no part of this
7 appropriation may be expended for soil and water conserva-
8 tion operations under the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C.
9 590a–590f), in demonstration projects: *Provided further,*
10 That not to exceed $5,000 may be used for employment pur-
11 suant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic
12 Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15
13 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided*
14 *further,* That not to exceed $265,000 of funds authorized
15 for fiscal year 1951 for development of land utilization proj-
16 ects may remain available until expended: *Provided further,*
17 That qualified local engineers may be temporarily employed
18 at per diem rates to perform the technical planning work of
19 the service.

20 WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

21 For expenses necessary to carry into effect the functions
22 of the Department under the Acts of May 10, 1939 (53 Stat.
23 685, 719), October 14, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 590y–z–10), as
24 amended and supplemented, June 28, 1949 (Public Law
25 132), and September 6, 1950 (Public Law 760), relating

1 to water conservation and utilization projects, to remain
2 available until expended, (35)~~$185,500~~ *$285,500*, which
3 sum shall be merged with the unexpended balances of funds
4 heretofore appropriated or transferred to said Department
5 for the purposes of said Act.

6 PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION
7 CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND
8 RESOURCES

9 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the pro-
10 visions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation
11 and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936,
12 as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q), including not to
13 exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, in-
14 cluding such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs
15 within the United States; (36)~~$256,500,000~~ *$280,000,000*,
16 to remain available until December 31 of the next succeeding
17 fiscal year for compliance with the program of soil-building
18 practices and soil- and water-conserving practices authorized
19 under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appro-
20 priation Act, 1951, carried out during the period July 1,
21 1950, to December 31, 1951, inclusive: *Provided*, That not
22 to exceed $25,250,000 of the total sum provided under
23 this head shall be available during the current fiscal year
24 for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying
25 out such program, the cost of aerial photographs, however,

1 not to be charged to such limitation; but not more than
2 $4,966,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account,
3 "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjust-
4 ment Act of 1938": *Provided further*, That payments to
5 claimants hereunder may be made upon the certificate of
6 the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the
7 Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the con-
8 servation practice or practices and has complied with all
9 other requirements as conditions for such payments and that
10 the statements and information contained in the application
11 for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge
12 and belief, under the penalties of title 18, United States Code:
13 *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated
14 or made available for the functions assigned to the Agri-
15 cultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order
16 Numbered 9069, of February 23, 1942, shall be used to
17 pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information
18 employees or any State information employees, but this shall
19 not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of in-
20 formation at the county level to individual farmers: *Provided*
21 *further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and
22 other administrative expenses in connection with the formu-
23 lation and administration of the 1952 program of soil-
24 building practices and soil- and water-conserving practices,
25 under the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended (amount-

1 ing to (37)~~$225,000,000~~ *$280,000,000,* including adminis-
2 tration, and formulated on the basis of a distribution of the
3 funds available for payments and grants among the several
4 States in accordance with their conservation needs as deter-
5 mined by the Secretary, except that the proportion allocated
6 to any State shall not be reduced more than 15 per centum
7 from the distribution for the next preceding program year,
8 and no participant shall receive more than $2,500) ; but the
9 payments or grants under such programs shall be conditioned
10 upon the utilization of land with respect to which such pay-
11 ments or grants are to be made in conformity with farming
12 practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building
13 and soil- and water-conserving practices in the most practical
14 and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several
15 States, as determined and approved by the State committees
16 appointed pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation
17 and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590h
18 (b)), for the respective States: *Provided further,* (38)~~That~~
19 ~~not to exceed 5 per centum of the allocation for the agricultural~~
20 ~~conservation program for any county may be allotted with~~
21 ~~the approval of the State committee to the Soil Conservation~~
22 ~~Service for services of its technicians in formulating and~~
23 ~~carrying out the agricultural conservation program and the~~
24 ~~funds so allotted shall not be utilized by the Soil Conserva-~~

1 ~~tion Service for any purpose other than technical and other~~
2 ~~assistance in such county~~ *That not to exceed 5 per centum*
3 *of the allocation for the agricultural conservation program*
4 *for any county may, on the recommendation of such county*
5 *committee and approval of the State committee, be withheld*
6 *and allotted to the Soil Conservation Service for services of*
7 *its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricul-*
8 *tural conservation program in the participating counties,*
9 *and the funds so allotted may be placed in a single account*
10 *for each State, and shall not be utilized by the Soil Conser-*
11 *vation Service for any purpose other than technical and*
12 *other assistance in such counties*: *Provided further,* That such
13 amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, ferti-
14 lizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any
15 soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agri-
16 cultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming
17 practices approved by the Secretary under programs provided
18 for herein: *Provided further,* That no part of any funds
19 available to the Department, or any bureau, office, cor-
20 poration, or other agency constituting a part of such Depart-
21 ment, shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment
22 of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been
23 convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent
24 pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as

amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of title 18, United States Code, section 1913, to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION PROGRAMS

To enable the Secretary to formulate and carry out acreage allotment and marketing quota programs pursuant to provisions of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1301–1393), including the measurement of the acreage planted to cotton on the farms whether or not marketing quotas are in effect, providing that not more than $1,000,000 shall be available for this purpose, and to provide assistance in obtaining equipment, materials, and facilities necessary to attain needed production of agricultural commodities, (39)~~$8,300,000~~ *$10,000,000,* of which not more than (40)~~$2,000,000~~ *$2,800,000* shall be transferred to the appropriation account "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938".

1 SUGAR ACT PROGRAM

2 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the pro-
3 visions of the Sugar Act of 1948 (7 U. S. C. 1101–1160),
4 $70,000,000, to remain available until June 30 of the next
5 succeeding fiscal year: *Provided,* That expenditures (includ-
6 ing transfers) from this appropriation for other than pay-
7 ments to sugar producers shall not exceed $1,500,000.

8 NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

9 To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of
10 the National School Lunch Act (42 U. S. C. 1751–1760),
11 (41)~~$83,500,000~~ *$83,367,491*: *Provided,* That no part of
12 this appropriation shall be used for nonfood assistance under
13 section 5 of said Act.

14 MARKETING SERVICES

15 For expenses necessary for acquiring and diffusing
16 market information on agricultural commodities, food prod-
17 ucts and by-products, the standardization, classification,
18 grading, handling, storage and marketing thereof, including
19 the demonstration and promotion of the use of uniform stand-
20 ards of classification of American farm and food products
21 throughout the world, the analysis of cotton fiber, the classing
22 of cotton for producer members of cotton quality improve-
23 ment groups, the establishment of classification standards and
24 maintenance of an inspection service for tobacco (7. U. S. C.
25 471–476, 501–508, 511–511q); for investigating and certi-

1 fying, in one or more jurisdictions, to shippers and other
2 interested parties the class, quality, and condition of any
3 agricultural commodity or food product, whether raw or
4 processed, and any product containing an agricultural com-
5 modity or derivative thereof when offered for interstate ship-
6 ment or when received at such important central markets as
7 the Secretary may from time to time designate, or at points
8 which may be conveniently reached therefrom under such
9 rules and regulations as he may prescribe, including the
10 collection of such fees as are reasonable and as nearly as may
11 cover the cost of the service rendered; for performing the
12 duties imposed upon the Secretary by chapter 14 of the
13 Internal Revenue Code relating to cotton futures (26
14 U. S. C. 1920–1935); and for carrying into effect the
15 United States Cotton Standards Act (7 U. S. C. 51–65),
16 the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U. S. C. 71–87),
17 the Naval Stores Act (7 U. S. C. 91–99), section 201 (a)
18 to 201 (d), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjust-
19 ment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1291), including not to
20 exceed $25,000 for employment at rates not to exceed $100
21 per diem, pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a),
22 of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended
23 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a),
24 the Acts to provide standards for containers for fruits and
25 vegetables (15 U. S. C. 251–257i), the United States Ware-

house Act (7 U. S. C. 241–273), the Federal Seed Act (7 U. S. C. 1551–1610), the Packers and Stockyards Act (7 U. S. C. 181–229), the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U. S. C. 135–135k), and the Tobacco Plant and Seed Exportation Act (7 U. S. C. 516), $10,800,000: *Provided,* **(42)**~~That hereafter appropriations available for classing or grading any agricultural commodity without charge to the producers thereof may be reimbursed from nonadministrative funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the cost of classing or grading any such commodity for producers who are eligible to obtain Commodity Credit Corporation price support~~ *That hereafter there may be transferred to appropriations available for classing or grading any agricultural commodity without charge to the producers thereof such sums from nonadministrative funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation as may be necessary in addition to other funds available for these purposes, such transfers to be reimbursed from subsequent appropiations therefor.*

COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1–17a), **(43)**~~$650,000~~ *$591,072.*

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

For operating and administrative expenses, **(44)**~~$8,000,000~~ *$7,949,911.*

1 RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

2 To carry into effect the provisions of the Rural Elec-
3 trification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–924),
4 as follows:

5 LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS

6 For loans in accordance with said Act, and for carry-
7 ing out the provisions of section 7 thereof, to be borrowed
8 from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the
9 provisions of section 3 (a) of said Act as follows: Rural
10 electrification program, $100,000,000; and rural telephone
11 program, $9,000,000; and additional amounts, not to ex-
12 ceed (45)~~a total of~~ (46)~~$100,000,000~~ *$75,000,000*, may be
13 borrowed for the rural electrification program (47), *and*
14 *$25,000,000 for the rural telephone program*, under the same
15 terms and conditions to the extent that such additional
16 amounts are required during the fiscal year 1952, under the
17 then existing conditions, for the expeditious and orderly de-
18 velopment of the program.

19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

20 For administrative expenses, including not to exceed
21 $500 for financial and credit reports, and not to exceed
22 $150,000 for employment pursuant to the second sentence
23 of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C.
24 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
25 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), $7,750,000.

1 FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

2 To carry into effect the provisions of titles I, II, and
3 the related provisions of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones
4 Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1000–1031),
5 the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946 (7 U. S. C.
6 1001, note; 31 U. S. C. 82h; 12 U. S. C. 371; 35 D. C.
7 Code 535; 60 Stat. 1062–1080); the Act of July 30, 1946
8 (40 U. S. C. 436–439); the Act of August 28, 1937, as
9 amended (16 U. S. C. 590r–590x, 590z–5), for the devel-
10 opment of facilities for water storage and utilization in the
11 arid and semiarid areas of the United States; the
12 provisions of title V of the Housing Act of 1949 relating
13 to financial assistance for farm housing (42 U. S. C. 1471–
14 1483); the Rural Rehabilitation Corporation Trust Liquida-
15 tion Act, approved May 3, 1950 (Public Law 499); and
16 the Act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey
17 certain mineral interests, approved September 6, 1950
18 (Public Law 760), as follows:

19 LOAN AUTHORIZATION

20 For loans (including payments in lieu of taxes and
21 taxes under section 50 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant
22 Act, as amended, and advances incident to the acquisition
23 and preservation of security of obligations under the fore-
24 going several authorities): Title I and section 43 of title IV
25 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and

1 title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (except grants under
2 504 (a)) $38,000,000, of which not to exceed $5,000,000
3 of the amount available for the purposes of title I and sec-
4 tion 43 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as
5 amended, may be distributed to States and Territories with-
6 out regard to farm population and prevalence of tenancy,
7 in addition to the amount otherwise distributed thereto, for
8 loans in reclamation projects and to entrymen on unpatented
9 public land (sums available for loans under title V of the
10 Housing Act of 1949 to remain available until expended);
11 title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as
12 amended, **(48)**~~$100,000,000~~ *$110,000,000*; the Act of
13 August 28, 1937, as amended, **(49)**~~$4,250,000~~ *$5,000,-*
14 *000*: *Provided,* That not to exceed the foregoing sev-
15 eral amounts shall be borrowed in one account from
16 the Secretary of the Treasury, and, hereafter, such sums
17 annually for the purposes of this paragraph as the
18 Congress may determine by provision in appropriation
19 acts, on the request of the Secretary of Agriculture, at
20 such rate of interest as may be determined by the Secre-
21 tary of the Treasury, but not in excess of 3 per centum
22 per annum; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby
23 authorized and directed to lend such sums to the Secretary
24 upon the security of any obligations of borrowers from
25 the Secretary under the provisions of said Acts: *Provided*

1 *further,* That the Secretary may utilize proceeds from
2 payments of principal and interest under such Acts to
3 repay the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts borrowed
4 therefrom for the purposes of such Acts: *Provided further,*
5 That for the purpose of making loans pursuant to the fore-
6 going authority, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized
7 to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the
8 sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond
9 Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may
10 be issued under that Act are extended to include such loans
11 to the Secretary: *Provided further,* That repayments to the
12 Secretary of the Treasury on such loans shall be treated as a
13 public-debt transaction.

14 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

15 For the making, servicing, and collecting of loans and
16 insured mortgages, the servicing and collecting of loans made
17 under prior authority, the liquidation of assets transferred
18 to Farmers' Home Administration pursuant to the Farmers'
19 Home Administration Act of 1946, the extension of financial
20 assistance under the Housing Act of 1949, and the adminis-
21 tration of assets transferred under subsection 2 (f) of the
22 Act of May 3, 1950, **(**50**)**~~$27,500,000~~ *$28,150,000,* to-
23 gether with a transfer to this appropriation item of not to
24 exceed $230,000 of the fees and administrative expense
25 charges made available by subsections (d) and (e) of sec-

1 tion 12 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as
2 amended.

3 FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

4 For necessary expenses, including library membership
5 fees or dues in organizations which issue publications to
6 members only or to members at a lower price than to others,
7 payment for which may be made in advance; not to exceed
8 $20,000 for expenditures authorized by section 602 of the
9 Organic Act of 1944 (12 U. S. C. 833); **(51)**~~$300,000~~
10 *$400,000*, together with not to exceed $2,325,000 of re-
11 ceipts from Farm Credit agencies, to be advanced to this
12 appropriation, to cover the cost of supervision, facilities,
13 examinations, and other services rendered to such agencies;
14 **(52)**~~$2,625,000~~ *$2,725,000*.

15 EXTENSION SERVICE

16 PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, ALASKA, AND PUERTO RICO

17 For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto
18 Rico, for cooperative agricultural extension work as follows:
19 Capper-Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts:
20 Capper-Ketcham Act, the Act approved May 22, 1928 (7
21 U. S. C. 343a, 343b), $1,480,000; Bankhead-Jones Act,
22 section 21, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7
23 U. S. C. 343c), $12,000,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, sec-
24 tion 23, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935, as
25 amended by the Act of June 6, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 343d–1),

1 $12,500,000; additional extension work, the Act approved
2 April 24, 1939, as amended (7 U. S. C. 343c–1), $555,000;
3 Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C.
4 386c); extending the benefits of the Smith-Lever Act to the
5 Territory of Alaska, $13,950, and the Act approved Octo-
6 ber 27, 1949 (7 U. S. C. 343d–4, 5), extending to
7 the Territory of Alaska the benefits of the Capper-
8 Ketcham Act and sections 21 and 23 of title II of
9 the Bankhead-Jones Act, $42,150; Puerto Rico, section 3
10 of the Act of March 4, 1931 (7 U. S. C. 386f), author-
11 izing extension of the Capper-Ketcham Act to Puerto Rico,
12 $31,348; the Act approved August 28, 1937 (7 U. S. C.
13 343f–343g), extending the benefits of section 21 of the
14 Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, $408,000, and the Act
15 approved October 26, 1949 (7 U. S. C. 343d–2, 3), ex-
16 tending the benefits of section 23 of title II of the Bank-
17 head-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, $71,502; and section 506a
18 of title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U. S. C. 1476),
19 $33,050; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and
20 Puerto Rico, $27,135,000.

21 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

22 For expenses necessary to administer the provisions of
23 the Smith-Lever Act, approved May 8, 1914 (7 U. S. C.
24 341–348), and Acts amendatory or supplementary thereto,
25 and to coordinate the extension work of the Department and

1 the several States, Territories, and insular possessions,
2 (53)~~$880,000~~ *$818,673.*

3 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

4 For expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agricul-
5 ture, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle
6 for replacement only; travel expenses, including examina-
7 tion of estimates for appropriations in the field; stationery,
8 supplies, materials, and equipment; freight, express, and
9 drayage charges; advertising of bids, communication service,
10 postage, washing towels, repairs and alterations, and other
11 miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for
12 and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Depart-
13 ment of Agriculture, (54)~~$2,082,200~~ *$1,992,168,* together
14 with such amounts from other appropriations or author-
15 izations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget
16 for the current fiscal year for such services and expenses,
17 which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be de-
18 termined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $109,280,
19 shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation:
20 *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appro-
21 priations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall
22 at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated,
23 respectively, therefor in the budget for such year, the
24 amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this
25 appropriation shall be increased or decreased in such amounts

as the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

For necessary expenses, including payment of fees or dues for the use of law libraries by attorneys in the field service, $2,200,000, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses which several amounts not exceeding a total of $207,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation.

OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

For necessary expenses for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations and for enabling the Secretary to coordinate and integrate activities of the Department in connection with foreign agricultural work, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only, (55)~~$600,000~~ *$548,054.*

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

For necessary expenses in connection with the publication, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins, documents, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and display of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and exhibits,

1 and the coordination of informational work and programs
2 authorized by Congress in the Department, (56)~~$1,271,000~~
3 *$1,215,268*, together with such amounts from other appro-
4 priations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules
5 in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses,
6 which several amounts not exceeding a total of $16,200, shall
7 be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation,
8 of which total appropriation amounts not exceeding those
9 specified may be used for the purposes enumerated as fol-
10 lows: For preparation and display of exhibits, $104,725;
11 for preparation, distribution, and display of motion and
12 sound pictures, $75,600; for farmers' bulletins, which
13 shall be adapted to the interests of the people of the
14 different sections of the country, an equal proportion
15 of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or sent out under
16 the addressed franks furnished by the Senators, Representa-
17 tives, and Delegates in Congress, as they shall direct (7
18 U. S. C. 417) and not less than two hundred thirty thousand
19 eight hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Senate and
20 House of Representatives of part 2 of the annual report of
21 the Secretary (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture),
22 as authorized by section 73 of the Act of January 12, 1895
23 (44 U. S. C. 241), $611,128: *Provided*, That additional
24 funds for preparation and display of agricultural motion
25 pictures and exhibits relating to the programs of the various

1 agencies of the Department authorized by Congress, not
2 exceeding $150,000, may be transferred to and made a
3 part of this appropriation, from the funds applicable, and
4 shall be available for the objects specified herein: *Provided*
5 *further,* That in the preparation of motion pictures or exhibits
6 by the Department, not exceeding a total of $10,000 may
7 be used for employment pursuant to the second sentence of
8 section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C.
9 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
10 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further,* That no part
11 of this appropriation shall be used for the establishment or
12 maintenance of regional or State field offices, or for the com-
13 pensation of employees in such offices.

14 LIBRARY

15 For necessary expenses, including dues for library
16 membership in societies or associations which issue publica-
17 tions to members only or at a price to members lower than
18 to subscribers who are not members; (57)~~$700,000~~ *$641,-*
19 *237.*

20 TITLE II—SPECIAL ACTIVITIES

21 RESEARCH ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL AGRICULTURAL
22 MATERIALS

23 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry
24 out his responsibilities under section 7 (b) of the Strategic
25 and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of July 23, 1946 (50

1 U. S. C. 98f), (58)~~$450,000~~ *$650,000*: *Provided,* That
2 this appropriation shall be subject to applicable provisions
3 contained in the item "Office of Administrator, Agricultural
4 Research Administration".

5 Eradication of Foot-and-Mouth Disease and Other Contagious
6 Diseases of Animals and Poultry, Agricultural Research
7 Administration

8 For expenses necessary in the arrest and eradication
9 of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuro-
10 pneumonia, or other contagious or infectious diseases of
11 animals, or European fowl pest and similar diseases in poul-
12 try, including the payment of claims growing out of past
13 and future purchases and destruction of animals (including
14 poultry) affected by or exposed to, or of materials con-
15 taminated by or exposed to, any such disease, wherever
16 found and irrespective of ownership, under like or substan-
17 tially similar circumstances, when such owner has complied
18 with all lawful quarantine regulations; and for foot-and-
19 mouth disease and rinderpest programs undertaken pur-
20 suant to the provisions of the Act of February 28, 1947, and
21 the Act of May 29, 1884, as amended (7 U. S. C. 391; 21
22 U. S. C. 111–122), including expenses in accordance with
23 section 2 of said Act of February 28, 1947, the Secretary may
24 transfer from other appropriations or funds available to the
25 bureaus, corporations, or agencies of the Department such

1 sums as he may deem necessary, to be available only in an
2 emergency which threatens the livestock or poultry industry
3 of the country, and any unexpended balances of funds trans-
4 ferred under this head in the next preceding fiscal year shall
5 be merged with such transferred amounts: *Provided,* That,
6 except for payments made pursuant to said Act of Febru-
7 ary 28, 1947, the payment for such animals hereafter pur-
8 chased may be made on appraisement based on the meat,
9 egg-production, dairy, or breeding value, but in case of ap-
10 praisement based on breeding value no appraisement of any
11 such animal shall exceed three times its meat, egg-produc-
12 tion, or dairy value, and, except in case of an extraordinary
13 emergency, to be determined by the Secretary, the pay-
14 ment by the United States Government for any such animals
15 shall not exceed one-half of any such appraisements: *Pro-*
16 *vided further,* That poultry may be appraised in groups
17 when the basis for appraisal is the same for each bird: *Pro-*
18 *vided further,* That this appropriation shall be subject to
19 applicable provisions contained in the item "Office of Ad-
20 ministrator, Agricultural Research Administration": *Pro-*
21 *vided further,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby
22 authorized and directed to discharge indebtedness of the
23 Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the
24 Treasury by canceling notes issued by the Corporation to
25 the Secretary of the Treasury in the amount of $32,700,000

1 for funds transferred and expenses incurred under this head
2 through fiscal year 1950 pursuant to authority granted in the
3 Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1950.

4 (59) *INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT*

5 *To discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit*
6 *Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury for the net*
7 *costs during the fiscal year 1950 under the International*
8 *Wheat Agreement Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C. 1641–*
9 *1642), $76,808,000*

10 TITLE III—CORPORATIONS

11 The following corporations and agencies are hereby au-
12 thorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of
13 funds and borrowing authority available to each such cor-
14 poration or agency and in accord with law, and to make
15 such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal
16 year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Gov-
17 ernment Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be
18 necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in
19 the budget for the fiscal year 1952 for such corporation or
20 agency, except as hereinafter provided:

21 Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

22 Commodity Credit Corporation: Nothing in this Act shall
23 be so construed as to prevent the Commodity Credit Corpora-
24 tion from carrying out any activity or any program authorized
25 by law: *Provided,* That not to exceed (60) ~~$15,000,000~~

1 *$16,500,000* shall be available for administrative expenses of
2 the Corporation: *Provided further,* That all necessary ex-
3 penses (including legal and special services performed on a
4 contract or fee basis, but not including other personal serv-
5 ices) in connection with the acquisition, operation, mainte-
6 nance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal
7 property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an
8 interest, including expenses of collections of pledged col-
9 lateral, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses
10 for the purposes hereof: *Provided further,* That the Sec-
11 retary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed
12 to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corpo-
13 ration to the Secretary of the Treasury by canceling notes
14 issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury
15 in the amount of the capital impairment determined by the
16 appraisal of June 30, 1950 (but not to exceed $427,-
17 000,000), pursuant to sections 1 and 4 of the Act of
18 March 8, 1938, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a–1, 4):
19 *Provided further,* That $1,000,000 of this appropriation shall
20 be placed in reserve, to be apportioned for use pursuant to
21 section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, only in
22 such amounts and at such times as may become necessary
23 due to the existence of substantial surpluses of the basic
24 commodities requiring mandatory price support.
25 Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation: Not to exceed

1 $1,100,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the
2 funds of the Corporation shall be available for administrative
3 expenses, including employment on a contract or fee basis of
4 persons, firms, and corporations for the performance of special
5 services, including legal services, and the use of the services
6 and facilities of Federal land banks, national farm loan asso-
7 ciations, Federal Reserve banks, and agencies of the Gov-
8 ernment as authorized by the Act of January 31, 1934
9 (12 U. S. C. 1020–1020h); and said total sum shall be
10 exclusive of services and facilities furnished and examina-
11 tions made by the Farm Credit Administration central
12 office, interest expense, and expenses in connection with
13 the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, pro-
14 tection, or disposition of real or personal property belong-
15 ing to the Corporation or in which it has an interest:
16 *Provided,* That promptly after June 30 of each fiscal year
17 all cash funds in excess of the estimated operating require-
18 ments for the current fiscal year shall be declared as divi-
19 dends and paid into the general fund of the Treasury: *Pro-*
20 *vided further,* That the aggregate amount of bonds the
21 Corporation may issue and have outstanding at any one time
22 shall not exceed $500,000,000.

23 Federal intermediate credit banks: Not to exceed
24 $1,496,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis)
25 of the funds of the banks shall be available for

1 administrative expenses and services performed for the
2 banks by other Government agencies (except services and
3 facilities furnished and examinations made by the Farm
4 Credit Administration central office, and services performed
5 by any Federal Reserve bank and by the United States
6 Treasury in connection with the financial transactions of
7 the banks); and said total sum shall be exclusive of interest
8 expense, legal and special services performed on a contract
9 or fee basis, and expenses in connection with the acquisition,
10 operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or dis-
11 position of real or personal property belonging to the banks
12 or in which they have an interest.

13 Production credit corporations: Not to exceed $1,-
14 358,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the
15 funds of the corporations shall be available for ad-
16 ministrative expenses and services performed for the cor-
17 porations by other Government agencies (except services
18 and facilities furnished and examinations made by the Farm
19 Credit Administration central office); and said total sum
20 shall be exclusive of interest expense, legal and special
21 services performed on a contract or fee basis, and expenses
22 in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance,
23 improvement, protection, or disposition of real or personal
24 property belonging to the corporations or in which they
25 have an interest.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law, the lump-sum appropriations and authorizations made for the Department under this Act shall be available for the purchase, in addition to those specifically provided for, of not to exceed (61)~~497~~ *350* passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and for the hire of such vehicles, necessary in the conduct of the work of the Department outside the District of Columbia.

SEC. 402. Provisions of law prohibiting or restricting the employment of aliens shall not apply to (1) the temporary employment of translators when competent citizen translators are not available; (2) employment in cases of emergency of persons in the field service of the Department for periods of not more than sixty days; and (3) employment under the appropriation for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations.

SEC. 403. Of appropriations herein made which are available for the purchase of lands, not to exceed $1 may be expended for each option to purchase any particular tract or tracts of land.

SEC. 404. No part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used for the payment of any officer or employee of the Department who, as such officer or employee, or on behalf of the Department or any division,

commission, or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued, any prediction, oral or written, or forecast, except as to damage threatened or caused by insects and pests, with respect to future prices of cotton or the trend of same.

SEC. 405. Except to provide materials required in or incident to research or experimental work where no suitable domestic product is available, no part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be expended in the purchase of twine manufactured from commodities or materials produced outside of the United States.

SEC. 406. Not less than $575,000 shall be available for contracts in accordance with section 10 (a) of the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427i) from appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Agricultural Economics; Bureau of Animal Industry; Bureau of Dairy Industry; Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering; Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine; Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry; Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics; and the Forest Service.

(62) ~~SEC. 407. No part of the funds made available by this Act may be used to compensate any person for employment in the Federal service outside the continental limits of the United States at a rate higher than is paid for comparable work in the Federal service within the continental~~

~~limits of the United States, other than a person who was a resident citizen of the continental United States at the date of his appointment to a position outside the continental limits of the United States and has had continuous employment in the Federal service (except as interrupted by service in the Armed Forces of the United States) from the date of such appointment.~~

SEC. (63)~~408~~ *407*. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Department is hereby authorized hereafter to employ or otherwise contract with persons at regular rates of pay for necessary hours of work for emergency forest fire fighting and pest control and for handling of animals, including dairy cattle, without regard to Sundays, Federal holidays, and the regular workweek.

SEC. (64)~~409~~ *408*. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this Act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the

1 person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions
2 of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of
3 the United States, is not a member of an organization of
4 Government employees that asserts the right to strike against
5 the Government of the United States, or that such person
6 does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization
7 that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the
8 United States by force or violence: *Provided further,* That
9 any person who engages in a strike against the Government
10 of the United States or who is a member of an organization
11 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike
12 against the Government of the United States, or who advo-
13 cates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates,
14 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by
15 force or violence and accepts employment the salary or
16 wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund
17 contained in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon
18 conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned
19 for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further,* That
20 the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in
21 substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Pro-*
22 *vided further,* That nothing in this section shall be construed
23 to require an affidavit from any person employed for less
24 than sixty days for sudden emergency work involving the
25 loss of human life or destruction of property, the payment

of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by this section.

No part of any appropriation contained in this Act or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

(65)~~SEC. 410. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided,* That this inhibition shall not apply—~~

~~(a) to not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;~~

~~(b) to positions filled from within the agency;~~

~~(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;~~

~~(d) to seasonal and casual workers;~~

~~(e) to meat inspectors;~~

~~(f) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2;~~

~~(g)~~ to field employees of the Soil Conservation ~~Service and Production and Marketing Administration~~

1 ~~who provide conservation assistance to farmers and~~
2 ~~ranchers~~.
3 ~~*Provided further,* That when any department or agency~~
4 ~~covered in this Act has reduced their employment rolls to~~
5 ~~80 per centum of the total number on their rolls as of July~~
6 ~~1, 1951, this limitation may cease to apply.~~
7 (66)*Sec. 409. In order to effect reductions in appropria-*
8 *tions for personal services equivalent to 10 percent or more*
9 *below the 1952 budget estimates, except for field operating*
10 *and research employees engaged in work of county offices*
11 *and other field locations, and except for the crop and livestock*
12 *reporting service, the following appropriations have been*
13 *reduced in the amounts indicated and obligations for personal*
14 *services shall not exceed the amount included in the budget*
15 *estimate less the amount so indicated, respectively, for each*
16 *appropriation:*
17 *Research and Marketing Act of 1946, $235,268.*
18 *Bureau of Agricultural Economics:*
19 *Economic investigations, $168,663.*
20 *Crop and livestock estimates, $17,696.*
21 *Agricultural Research Administration:*
22 *Office of Administrator, $45,560.*
23 *Research on agricultural problems of Alaska,*
24 *$18,450.*

1 *Research on strategic and critical agricultural ma-*
2 *terials, $33,580.*
3 *Office of Experiment Stations:*
4 *Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto*
5 *Rico, $12,990.*
6 *Salaries and expenses, $32,910.*
7 *Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics,*
8 *$111,670.*
9 *Bureau of Animal Industry:*
10 *Salaries and expenses:*
11 *Animal research, $215,671.*
12 *Animal disease control and eradication,*
13 *$186,978.*
14 *Marketing agreements, hog cholera, virus*
15 *and serum, $1,394.*
16 *Meat inspection, $48,012.*
17 *Bureau of Dairy Industry, $97,510.*
18 *Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry,*
19 *$585,949.*
20 *Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural*
21 *Engineering:*
22 *Plant, soil, and agricultural engineering re-*
23 *search, $370,670.*
24 *National Arboretum, $11,680.*

1 *Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine:*

2 *Salaries and expenses:*

3 *Insect investigations, $110,275.*

4 *Insect and plant disease control, $43,938.*

5 *Plant quarantines, $30,483.*

6 *Control of emergency outbreaks of insects and*

7 *plant diseases, $6,871.*

8 *Total, Agricultural Research Administra-*

9 *tion, $1,964,591.*

10 *Control of forest pests:*

11 *Forest Pest Control Act, $3,286.*

12 *White pine blister rust, $25,737.*

13 *Forest Service:*

14 *Salaries and expenses:*

15 *National forest protection and management,*

16 *$373,351.*

17 *Forest research, $278,897.*

18 *Total, salaries and expenses, $652,248.*

19 *Forest development roads and trails, $116,047.*

20 *Acquisition of lands for national forests:*

21 *Weeks Act, $897.*

22 *Special acts, $320.*

23 *State and private forestry cooperation, $65,959.*

24 *Cooperative range improvements, $1,159.*

25 *Flood control, $152,465.*

1 *Soil Conservation Service, $803,009.*

2 *Water conservation and utilization projects, $6,919.*

3 *Production and Marketing Administration:*

4 *Conservation and use of agricultural land resources,*

5 *$400,620.*

6 *Agricultural production programs, $335,138.*

7 *Sugar Act program, $93,941.*

8 *National school-lunch program, $132,509.*

9 *Marketing services, $248,135.*

10 *Commodity Exchange Authority, $58,928.*

11 *Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, $250,089.*

12 *Rural Electrification Administration: Salaries and ex-*

13 *penses, $455,602.*

14 *Farmers' Home Administration:*

15 *Salaries and expenses, $982,300.*

16 *Farm Credit Administration (direct appropriation),*

17 *$46,641.*

18 *Extension Service:*

19 *Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto*

20 *Rico, $20,255.*

21 *Salaries and expenses, $68,827.*

22 *Office of the Secretary, $199,082.*

23 *Office of the Solicitor, $231,010.*

24 *Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, $51,946.*

25 *Office of Information, $55,732.*

1 *Library, $58,763.*

2 *Removal of surplus agricultural commodities (perma-*
3 *nent appropriation—administrative expenses), $325,453.*
4 *Provided, That nothing in the foregoing shall be construed to*
5 *effect greater reductions than have been made in the indi-*
6 *vidual appropriation paragraphs in this Act: Provided fur-*
7 *ther, That not to exceed $3,047,079 of the funds appropriated*
8 *under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1945, shall be*
9 *available in the current fiscal year for personal services in the*
10 *Department of Agriculture in carrying out the purposes of*
11 *such Act, as amended, including marketing agreements and*
12 *orders.*

13 (67) *Sec. 410. No part of any appropriation or authoriza-*
14 *tion contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensa-*
15 *tion of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the*
16 *number that would be provided by a ratio of one such em-*
17 *ployee to one hundred and fifteen, or a part thereof, full-time,*
18 *part-time, and intermittent employees of the Department and*
19 *its instrumentalities, cooperators and collaborators receiving*
20 *personnel services from the Department: Provided, That for*
21 *purposes of this section employees shall be considered as en-*
22 *gaged in personnel work if they spend half-time or more in*
23 *personnel administration consisting of direction and adminis-*
24 *tration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and*
25 *separation; job evaluation and classification; employee rela-*

1 *tions and services; training; committees of expert examiners*
2 *and boards of civil service examiners; wage administration;*
3 *and processing, recording, and reporting: Provided further,*
4 *That nothing contained in this section shall be construed as*
5 *permitting any increase whatever in personnel officers over and*
6 *above the number otherwise provided for in this Act.*

7 (68) *SEC. 411. Except for the car officially assigned to the*
8 *Secretary of Agriculture, no part of any appropriation con-*
9 *tained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any*
10 *civilian employee of the Government whose duties consist of*
11 *acting as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger*
12 *motor vehicle (other than a bus or ambulance), unless such*
13 *appropriation is specifically authorized to be used for paying*
14 *the compensation of employees performing such duties.*

15 (69) *SEC. 412. No part of the money appropriated for the*
16 *Department of Agriculture by this Act or made available for*
17 *expenditure by any corporation by this Act which is in excess*
18 *of 75 per centum of the amount required to pay the compen-*
19 *sation of all persons the budget estimates for personal services*
20 *heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952*
21 *contemplated would be employed by the Department of*
22 *Agriculture or by such corporation, respectively, during such*
23 *fiscal year in the performance of—*

24 *(1) functions performed by a person designated*
25 *as an information specialist, information and editorial*

1 *specialist, publications and information coordinator, press*
2 *relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert,*
3 *television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity*
4 *expert, or designated by any similar title, or*
5 *(2) functions performed by persons who assist*
6 *persons performing the functions described in (1) in*
7 *drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or dis-*
8 *seminating public information publications or releases,*
9 *radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photo-*
10 *graphs, motion pictures, and similar material,*
11 *shall be available to pay the compensation of persons per-*
12 *forming the functions described in (1) or (2).*
13 SEC. (70)~~411~~ *413*. This Act may be cited as the "De-
14 partment of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1952".

Passed the House of Representatives May 17, 1951.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk.

Passed the Senate with amendments July 27 (legislative day, July 24), 1951.

Attest: LESLIE L. BIFFLE,
Secretary.

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3973

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 27, 1951

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS
OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued July 30, 1951
For actions of July 27, 1951
82nd-1st, No. 138

CONTENTS

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed agricultural appropriation bill. Senate agreed to conference report on defense-production bill; House received report. House committee reported baler-twine bill. Both Houses agreed to conference report on fur-labeling bill. Senate passed Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill.

SENATE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952. Passed, 65-6, with amendments this bill, H. R. 3973 (pp. 9194-208). Sens. Russell, Hayden, O'Mahoney, McCarran, Ellender, Wherry, Young, and Ferguson were appointed Senate conferees (p. 9208).

Agreed to the following amendments:

By Sen. Ferguson, providing that "Except for the car officially assigned to the Secretary of Agriculture, no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government whose duties consist of acting as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle (other than a bus or ambulance), unless such appropriation is specifically authorized to be used for paying the compensation of employees performing such duties" (pp. 9194-5).

By Sen. Byrd, limiting to 75% of the Budget estimates the funds to pay personnel employed as "information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity expert..." or personnel who assist such employees through typing, drafting, etc. (pp. 9195-6).

By Sen. Douglas, to reduce from 497 to 350 the number of new automobiles authorized for purchase (p. 9201).

Rejected the following amendments:

By Sen. Williams, to strike out the provisions for cancellation of CCC notes in the amounts of $32,700,000 and $427,000,000 so that these amounts would have to be considered for direct appropriation (pp. 9197-201, 9207).

By Sen. Chavez, to make available under the Water Facilities Act the unexpended balances appropriated under Sec. 504 (a) of the Housing Act of 1949. Rejected a motion by Sen. Chavez to suspend the rules and agree to the amendment after the proposal had been ruled out of order. (pp. 9203-6.)

Sen. Saltonstall expressed interest in research on gypsy moth, brown tailed moth, and Dutch elm disease, and Sen. Russell said it was within the Department's discretion to determine how much would be spent on these items (pp. 9196-7).

Sens. Schoeppel and Wherry urged adequate appropriations for research on wheat mosaic and other items (pp. 9201-2).

Sen. Stennis commended the program for State and private forestry cooperation (p. 9203).

Sen. Russell inserted a BLS report on work time to buy food in various countries (pp. 9206-7).

2. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. Agreed to the conference report on S. 1717, to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 (pp. 9215-17, 9230-4). The report was received in the House but not acted upon (pp. 9312-21). The text of the entire bill, as revised by the conferees, is printed in the Record (pp. 9312-18). The following were among the actions taken by the conferees: Changed the import-controls provision so that the findings would be made by the Secretary of Agriculture, the provision would apply until June 30, 1952, and the President would exercise the authority provided in the provision. Adopted the House provision on purchases for Government use or resale but modified it so as to limit to imported agricultural commodities the provision barring contracts calling for delivery more than 1 year after expiration of the act. Eliminated the House provision that no ceiling-price determination shall be made on the sole basis of comparative profits. Agreed to the House provision that no ceiling shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity, including livestock, below 90% of the price received by producers on May 19, 1951. Adopted a modified provision regarding rollbacks on non-agricultural commodities and services. Agreed to a provision that no ceiling prices to producers of milk or butterfat used for manufacturing dairy products shall be issued unless and until the Secretary of Agriculture determines that such prices are reasonable in view of certain prescribed standards. Eliminated the House provision regarding exemption of public utilities and common carriers from price control under certain circumstances. Adopted a modified version of the House provision to preserve customary margins for sellers.

3. TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952. Passed with amendments this bill H. R. 3282, and appointed conferees (pp. 9208, 9212-5, 9217-30). Before final passage of the bill, the following amendments were agreed to, among others:

By Sen. Ferguson, to reduce funds for the Treasury Department for personal services 10% below budget estimates, with certain bureaus excepted, by a vote of 43 to 23 (pp. 9222-5).

By Sen. Bridges, reducing by $176,303 funds for general administration of the Post Office and limiting funds for personal services to $17,105,765, by a vote of 38 to 29 (pp. 9221-2).

By Sen. Ferguson, restricting the operation of automobiles in the Post Office and Treasury Departments by chauffeurs (p. 9226).

By Sen. Douglas, providing the same leave system for postal employees as for employees of other Departments, as modified by an amendment by Sen. Carlson extending these leave changes to temporary and indefinite Post Office employees, after agreeing 63 to 0 to suspend the rules and permit the amendment to be offered (pp. 9227-9).

4. LEGAL PROCEDURES. Agreed to the House amendments, with modifications, to S. J. Res. 82, to keep in effect until May 1, 1952, the present uniform procedure for the conduct and trial of property condemnation proceedings (pp. 9208-9).

5. WOOL. Sen. O'Mahoney stated that newspaper stories to the effect that the Govern-

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 97 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JULY 27, 1951 No. 138

Senate

(Legislative day of Tuesday, July 24, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, whose inward fellowship means cleansing, peace and power, we come asking that there may be dissolved the barriers that keep our souls from Thee. Save us, we pray, from a towering self-sufficiency that will not even recognize our need, from an impenitence too proud to confess guilt, and from the spiritual blindness that sees vividly the visible but is unaware of the invisible and eternal. May this noontide pause in the busy day be but the symbol of zones of quiet we habitually keep inviolate around our too agitated lives. We confess that the world is too much with us, in getting and spending we lay waste our powers. Save us from crippling pessimism and despair. Build Thou our inner strength and grant that we may be among those who stand in the evil day and having done all still stand. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 26, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4601. An act to provide that the admissions tax shall not apply in respect of admissions free of charge of uniformed members of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

H. R. 4740. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 997) for the relief of William J. Drinkwine, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 4601. An act to provide that the admissions tax shall not apply in respect of admissions free of charge of uniformed members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 4740. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. SALTONSTALL, and by unanimous consent, he and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey were excused from attendance on the session of the Senate later this afternoon for 2 hours in order to attend the funeral of Admiral Sherman.

CORRECTIONS OF THE RECORD

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in the RECORD of July 25, 1951, at page 9071, in the last paragraph of the second column, in the course of the colloquy with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I am quoted as saying:

> But it seems to me that the statement of the Senator from Illinois that they know this program will cause more limestone to be used on the land is inconsistent with his general contention that the farmers will not participate whether they receive Federal assistance or not.

The use of the word "not" in the third line from the bottom is in error, and I ask that it be stricken and the RECORD corrected accordingly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The correction will be made.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, on Wednesday, July 11, 1951, I announced that I was reporting favorably Senate bill (S. 1136) to place in the Administrator of General Services responsibility for coordination of certain miscellaneous activities in the District of Columbia in accordance with a recommendation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, and Senate bill (S. 1147) to provide for the transfer of the Displaced Persons Commission and the War Claims Commission to the Department of State, in accordance with a recommendation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I should have stated that the bills were being reported without recommendation.

I ask unanimous consent that the word "favorably" be stricken out in each statement and the words "without recommendation" be inserted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the corrections will be made.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD, and transact routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATOR McCARTHY'S EXPOSÉ OF COMMUNISM—RESOLUTION OF YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUB OF WINNEBAGO COUNTY, WIS.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Young Republican Club of Winnebago County, Wis., in support of the efforts of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] to expose communism.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Whereas it is felt that many people have lost sight of the aims and fundamental objectives of Senator JOSEPH McCARTHY's crusade against communism; and
>
> Whereas we feel that Senator McCARTHY fearlessly pioneered against great opposition to expose this Communist menace; and
>
> Whereas many people have been misled by attempts on the part of certain dissident elements of the population to discredit and disparage Senator McCARTHY; Now, therefore, let it be

Resolved, That the Young Republican Club of Winnebago County does hereby congratulate and commend Senator McCarthy for his outstanding service to the American people in spearheading the drive to rid our Government of traitorous elements; be it further

Resolved, That we, the Young Republican Club of Winnebago County, stand ready to support Senator McCarthy wholeheartedly in all his efforts to expose communism, appeasement of fuzzy-minded internationalists, and enemies of Christianity, the American representative republic, and of man as an individual.

Oshkosh, Wis., *July 25, 1951.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 1199. A bill to amend section 12 of the Missing Persons Act, as amended, relating to travel by dependents and transportation of household and personal effects; with amendments (Rept. No. 584).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 3782. A bill to authorize a per capita payment to members of the Menominee Tribe of Indians; with an amendment (Rept. No. 585).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1907. A bill to authorize the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 1908. A bill for the relief of Charles H. Craft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

S. 1909. A bill for the relief of Henry Bongart and Evelyn Bongart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1910. A bill for the relief of the racially ineligible Tane Watanabe fiancée of a United States citizen veteran of World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 1911. A bill for the relief of Michael David Liu, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1912. A bill to provide for conveyance of certain land to the city of New Orleans; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ellender when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1913. A bill to authorize the use of appropriations for refunding moneys erroneously received and covered for the refund of forfeited bail; and

S. 1914 (by request). A bill to amend section 2151 of title 18, United States Code, relating to sabotage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1915. A bill for the relief of Mohamed Akbar Khan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 1916. A bill for the relief of Olga Madsen, a minor; and

S. 1917. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Oveida Mohrke and her son, Gerard Mohrke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1918. A bill for the incorporation of the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 1919. A bill for the relief of Sister Anna Ettl;

S. 1920. A bill for the relief of Tara Singh; and

S. 1921. A bill for the relief of Efstratios Maravelios (also known as Steve Maravelias); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO CITY OF NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to convey certain land to the city of New Orleans, La., and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill by me be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1912) to provide for conveyance of certain land to the city of New Orleans, introduced by Mr. Ellender, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The explanatory statement is as follows:

Statement by Senator Ellender

During 1944, the Civil Aeronautics Administration undertook a project for the development of the Moisant International Airport (formerly Kenner-Moisant Airport). It was determined that certain lands were needed to accomplish the necessary development and to protect the airport. In order to expedite the acquisition of the needed lands, the United States Corps of Engineers, the construction agency, agreed to acquire the land by condemnation in the name of the United States with the city of New Orleans putting up the money for the purchase price and for all necessary expenses. It was understood that once the United States had title to the lands that it would reconvey the lands to the city of New Orleans. The city issued checks in the amount of $300,000 to the Treasurer of the United States and the Corps of Engineers proceeded with the condemnation proceedings and took title to the land in the name of the United States. Further, the city, in reliance on the assurances it had received from the Government, spent additional amounts on improvements to the lands in question and has induced a private individual to invest his funds on improvements which are located on the lands. The Government recently completed condemnation. The city has requested the Corps of Engineers to convey the fee simple title to the land to it. Certain war powers which the Corps of Engineers had during the war have expired and the Corps of Engineers cannot convey the lands in question without authority from General Services Administration. The General Services Administration will not approve a direct conveyance of fee simple title to the lands in view of the fact that there is no written contract in existence in which the United States affirmatively obligated itself to reconvey the lands in question to the city of New Orleans. However, the General Services Administration authorized the Department of Defense to dispose of the property in accordance with the provisions of section 502 (a) (1) of Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress, which continued in effect the section 13 (g) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended. The city of New Orleans will not accept a transfer under those conditions since such a disposal would make the lands subject to a number of restrictions and conditions whereas the appropriation of the $300,000 by the city was made with the understanding that the city would get unencumbered fee simple title to the property.

The Department of Defense has not developed any of the property in question.

In view of the above, it is believed that some agency of the United States Government, preferably the Department of Defense, should be authorized to convey to the city of New Orleans fee simple title to the lands in question in order to enable the Government to fulfill its obligation to the city.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

Statement by Senator Kerr on July 27, 1951, before the Subcommittee on Army Civil Functions of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, regarding the necessity for flood-control appropriations.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Editorials entitled "Finland Stands Firm," and "Finland and Neighbor," regarding the recent elections in Finland.

By Mr. WILEY:

Editorials condemning the sale of narcotic drugs to teen-age children, the first entitled "Get the Narcotics Sellers," published in the Racine (Wis.) Journal-Times of July 10, 1951; the second entitled "Kill That Rattlesnake," published in the July 19, 1951, issue of the Manitowoc (Wis.) Herald-Times.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

Editorial entitled "A Plan To Conserve the Taxpayer and His Dollar," published in the Baltimore Sun of July 26, 1951, regarding a proposal by Senator McClellan and Senator Moody to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

By Mr. KEM:

Editorial entitled "They're Lions at Home," published in the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald of July 20, 1951.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Ferguson] for himself and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Bridges], which will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 65, line 4, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

Sec. —. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government whose duties consist of acting as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle (other than a bus or ambulance), unless such appropriation is specifically authorized to be used for paying the compensation of employees performing such duties.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time consumed in calling the roll not be charged to either side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hennings	Moody
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Morse
Benton	Hill	Mundt
Bricker	Hoey	Nixon
Bridges	Holland	O'Conor
Butler, Md.	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Ives	Pastore
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Chavez	Kem	Saltonstall
Clements	Kerr	Schoeppel
Connally	Kilgore	Smathers
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Lodge	Sparkman
Dworshak	Magnuson	Stennis
Eastland	Malone	Taft
Ecton	Maybank	Underwood
Ellender	McCarran	Watkins
Ferguson	McCarthy	Wherry
Frear	McClellan	Wiley
Gillette	McFarland	Williams
Green	McKellar	Young
Hayden	Millikin	
Hendrickson	Monroney	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], on behalf of himself and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan has 15 minutes at his disposal.

Mr. FERGUSON. The minority leader was engaged, and I did not wish to interrupt him.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Michigan, as the sponsor of the amendment, is entitled to 15 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, when the consideration of the appropriation bill was resumed the distinguished President of the Senate, stated the question on the pending amendment, following which we had a quorum call. My understanding is that the time consumed in calling the quorum was not charged to either side. As the sponsor of the amendment, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is in charge of 15 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan has 15 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I modify my amendment, and I ask that the amendment, as modified, be stated by the clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment, as modified, will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 65, line 4, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. Except for the car officially assigned to the Secretary of Agriculture, no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government whose duties consist of acting as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle (other than a bus or ambulance), unless such appropriation is specifically authorized to be used for paying the compensation of employees performing such duties.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, for the RECORD, let me say that as of July 1, 1950, the last official report I have, the Department of Agriculture had seven full-time chauffeurs in the District of Columbia and none in the field.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am willing to take the amendment to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I call up my amendment "7-25-51—A."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 65, between lines 3 and 4, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 411. No part of the money appropriated for the Department of Agriculture by this act or made available for expenditure by any corporation by this act which is in excess of 75 percent of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the budget estimates for personal services heretofore submited to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952 contemplated would be employed by the Department of Agriculture or by such corporation, respectively, during such fiscal year in the performance of—

(1) functions performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title, or

(2) functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions described in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating public information publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion pictures, and similar material,

shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing the functions described in (1) or (2).

On page 65, line 4, strike out "411" and insert in lieu thereof "412."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senate has already adopted an identical amendment on another bill, and I am willing to take this amendment to conference, to see what can be done with it.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the amendment which has been accepted by the Senator from Georgia, known as the publicity amendment, was adopted on the independent offices appropriation bill by a recorded vote of 60 to 10. It was also adopted on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD, at this point, as a part of my remarks, an explanatory statement regarding the amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLICITY AMENDMENT TO AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, BY SENATOR BYRD, WITH SENATOR FERGUSON

THE AMENDMENT

"No money appropriated by this act to any corporation or agency shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing information functions or related supporting functions, if the amount expended by such corporation or agency during the fiscal year 1952 to pay such compensation is in excess of 75 percent of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952 contemplated would be employed by such corporation or agency during such fiscal year in the performance of information functions and related supporting functions. For the purposes of this section, the term "information functions" means functions usually performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press-relations officer or counsel, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title; and the term "related supporting functions" means functions performed by persons who assist persons performing information functions in the drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating of public information publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, and similar material."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

The purpose of this amendment is to correct one of the greatest abuses in our governmental services. Since 1913 it has been illegal by virtue of an act of Congress, for governmental agencies to employ any publicity experts unless appropriations are specifically made for that purpose. Notwithstanding that, every agency of the Government has publicity agents. It is true they are not called by that name, but they are scattered throughout the departments. I am presenting an amendment, which is the only way by which the question can be reached, which provides that for the purpose of information functions only 75 percent of the money recommended by the Bureau of the Budget shall be available for expenditure under this bill.

I call attention to a long fight which has been made for the purpose of trying to eliminate these publicity agents, whose employment, as I have said, has been illegal since 1913, when an act was placed on the statute books providing that no money appropriated by Congress should be used for the compen-

sation of any publicity expert, unless specifically appropriated for that purpose.

The effect of the amendment would be, as I said, to limit expenditure of funds appropriated in this act for personal service to 75 percent of the amount requested by the President in his budget estimates to pay employees whose functions are those of publicity experts and their assistants, and those engaged in related supporting activities, such as typing, mimeographing, mailing, and so forth.

Individual glorification of bureaucrats and political propaganda constitute the press service problem which this amendment seeks to curtail. It has been a problem for a long time. Since 1913, as I said, there has been a statute on the books providing that no money appropriated by Congress shall be used for the compensation of any publicity expert unless specifically appropriated for that purpose.

On pages 4409 and 4410 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 6, 1913, the problem was summed up in the debate as follows:

"No persons should be employed as a press agent by a Government agency to extoll his boss or to advertise the work of the department, but we ought to have men in the various departments to make available facts about the work of these departments to the public."

The amendment which is proposed by myself and the Senators associated with me allows a sufficient appropriation to make facts available about the work of the departments, but it will, I think, compel the dismissal of all those who are being employed as publicity experts, of whom there are many thousands of them, and who are acting as such.

In 1937, the Brookings Institution, in a report for the Senate Select Committee To Investigate Executive Agencies of the Government, said:

"Notwithstanding the fact that the employment of publicity experts is forbidden by the act of October 22, 1913 (38 Stat. L. 208, 212), unless funds are specifically appropriated for that purpose, publicity agents are nevertheless appointed under other designations, and one of the results has been an increasing flood of press releases produced by the process method."

Later, in 1947, the House committee headed by Representative Harness said:

"It is a duty of representative government to keep the people fully and accurately informed. Administrative officials at policy-making levels are, and should be, entirely free to express their views and discuss policy on any issue. But beyond the regular news channels no agency properly may go. The information services of the administrative agencies may not lawfully use public funds to promote new projects, to influence legislation, or to mold public opinion for or against any legislative proposal. * * * The sole legal function of Federal information service is to issue factual objective, and studiously unbiased information.

"Unfortunately, the law is being violated repeatedly by numerous administrative agencies. In hundreds of ways, some devious, some blatant. Federal officials and employees are ignoring or flouting section 201 of title 18 of the Criminal Code, often for the deliberate purpose of fostering sentiment and support for administration policies and programs.

"The issue is far broader than the merits of any particular piece of legislation. The record reveals clearly the manner in which Government lobbyists operate on the Federal payroll, how they are always at work to expand their fields of interests, to perpetuate themselves in office, and to impose their ideas and systems upon the American people by organized propaganda paid for entirely by the diversion of public funds from their true purposes to the secret purposes of top bureaucrats and planners."

Then the Hoover Commission task force said:

"Every agency of the Government maintains its public relations staff. Every agency issues printed matter in great or small volume every year for public distribution. Printing costs on Government literature approach $50,000,000 a year, and the mailing costs computed at regular postage rates add $40,000,000 a year.

Staff salaries in publicity functions were tabulated by the Bureau of the Budget for fiscal year 1948 at $13,000,000, but this figure does not include editorial and research expense in the preparation of Government intelligence. The Budget Bureau's itemization begins with preparations of the press release, radio continuity, or motion-picture scrips. The research and testing behind the press release are not charged to the publicity function but rather to the routine administrative expenses of the department.

"In many cases public-relations work is concealed entirely from routine accounting review, principally by the device of carrying publicity operatives on the roll as supervisors, administrative assistants, or technical experts."

For these reasons in the present state of the Federal budget and accounting procedures, a precise itemization of Government expenditures in this broad field is almost impossible.

For this reason the language of the pending amendment is directed to functions performed, no matter what the title may be, or at what station in civil-service ranks and grades the employees may be.

In this bill, and in the Government, now it is still virtually impossible to determine how many people there are engaged in so-called information work in the Federal Government, but the Civil Service Commission admits to 4,199 who can be positively identified in these positions. A check of the appendix to the budget document reveals that of this number there are more than 100 such positions covered by the independent offices appropriation bill, and that the salaries run to nearly three-quarters of a million dollars. Undoubtedly there are others in high positions who cannot be identified in the detailed personnel tables, and still others engaged in clerical, mechanical, and transportation jobs connected with publicity which would more than double—probably treble—both the number of people involved and the personal-service costs.

But this is not all that is involved. We become involved also in the paper shortage, in the purchase of duplicating equipment, and especially in the cost of disseminating the material through the mail.

The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures on April 19 started a sampling of material printed and otherwise duplicated by Government agencies for public dissemination. In 2 months, exclusive of the material printed by the Government Printing Office, Government publications, mimeographed and otherwise processed, have been received at the rate of a file case full a week, exclusive of envelopes and wrappings. That means single statements and all publicity sent out. By actual count in the mails of Saturday and Monday morning 2,226 separate pieces were received. All of this, of course, was delivered under the free penalty mail privileges. On page 741 of the budget document, the Post Office Department reveals that in fiscal year 1952 it expects to handle 1,780,100,000 pieces of penalty mail from Government departments and agencies in the executive branch. That is approximately a letter a month from the executive branch departments and agencies to every man, woman, and child in the country. This volume of penalty mail represents an increase of nearly a hundred million a day over the volume handled last year, which totaled less than a billion and a half pieces.

Examples of some of the material which is going throuh the mails is a pamphlet called Filipino Women—Their Role in the Progress of Their Nation, published by the Labor Department; Raccoons of North and Middle America; North American Fauna No. 60, published by the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; and then there is the gem by the ECA entitled "ECA's Dilemma—Can Elephants and Water Buffalos Outwork Machinery?" This is a little article about 5-day weeks for elephants working in Burma.

The ECA has found that elephants do not like to work in the hot sun, and that in March and April they should be sent to a rest camp, and also that they should be given about 2 weeks vacation again in October.

That is where some of our money is going.

It is no wonder that other Senators and I are receiving numerous complaints about the stuff which is being received by citizens all over the country, about the uselessness of the material which they are receiving through the mails, in the nature of Government publications from the executive departments of the Government.

I receive letters, and I assume other Senators receive similar letters, saying "For God's sake stop sending all this mail." It is thrown away because the recipients have no use for it; yet the mails are filled up with it.

As I have said, this material which is now coming into our office does not include any publications disseminated by the Government Printing Office. In addition, publications disseminated by the Government Printing Office, printed in fine type, cover 78 pages of an attractive green-bound monthly catalog, and exclusive of the Military Establishment, the Government's printing bill for fiscal year 1952 is estimated at $41,000,000, and the Military Establishment will more than double this figure when the estimates are counted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I do not have an amendment to offer to the bill, but I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia a question concerning a statement in the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is nothing pending before the Senate which gives any Senator a right to the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Massachusetts may be permitted to propound a question to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Georgia to page 4 of the report, the last paragraph thereof. The paragraph concerns the use of funds for research with respect to the wheat stem sawfly.

It states:

> The balance of the increase is intended to lessen the curtailment of research that would be required by the House reduction, such as the work on Japanese beetle parasites and diseases.

In New England we are particularly interested in the research concerning the gypsy moth, the brown tailed moth, and the terrible infection which is attacking our elms, called the Dutch elm disease. My question is whether the re-

search is limited to the wheat stem sawfly, or whether, providing there is sufficient money available, the reasearch may include also studies of the gypsy moth, the brown tailed moth, the Dutch elm disease, and other infections of that character.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the subcommittee has dealt with the question of the Japanese beetle and the Dutch elm disease, as well as the brown tailed moth, for a number of years. One of the great tragedies suffered by the Nation has been the loss of many magnificent elm trees in New England. There is nothing whatever to prevent the Department of Agriculture from applying some of the funds to research work in the fields indicated by the Senator from Massachusetts. It is a matter within the discretion of the Department. We did not restore all of the reduction which was made by the House on these items, but such funds are available, after deducting the specific amounts which are set aside in the committee report, and could be applied to the work to which the Senator from Massachusetts refers, if the officials in the Department of Agriculture saw fit to so apply them.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Georgia. In other words, it is entirely up to those who want that kind of research carried on to satisfy the Department of Agriculture that it should be done.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, within the limitation of the funds which are available.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, which I ask the clerk to state.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 50, line 19, beginning with the words "Provided further", it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 2, page 51.

On page 52, line 3, beginning with the words "Provided further", it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 11.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware submits two amendments which relate to the same subject but appear on two different pages. Is there objection to the consideration of the amendments en bloc?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, at the outset I wish to point out that the amendment would neither save any money nor cost any money. It involves merely a matter of bookkeeping.

The first proposal is to strike out the proviso on page 50, under which it is proposed to cancel $32,700,000 worth of notes of the Commodity Credit Corporation for one purpose. The proviso on page 52 would cancel notes not exceeding $427,000,000.

The principle involved is the same as that which was involved in the amendment offered yesterday providing for the cancellation of notes of the Commodity Credit Corporation under the international wheat agreement.

It has been my contention all the time that the American people would understand this aspect of the agricultural program better if we required that direct cash appropriations be made and if we required the Department to justify such appropriations before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. As the situation now is, we are being asked to provide approximately $450,000,000 for which there has been no justification before any committee, nor will any justification be requested later, if these items are now approved.

In my opinion, the Secretary of Agriculture should be forced to appear before the committee and state what he wants the money for; he should be required to state that he wants so much money in order to make up for what has been lost under the support program for corn, and that he wants so much money in order to make up for what has been lost under the support program for potatoes, in connection with which he has been destroying potatoes. If he wants to be able to feed raisins to hogs in California, as has been done, let him say so and let him tell the American people how much it is costing. If the Secretary of Agriculture wants to buy eggs, let him say so, and let him tell the American people how much it is costing. Let the program be broken down item by item, and let the Secretary of Agriculture justify, if he can, each part of the program.

Several years ago I called the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture was circulating generally over the country literature in which he was boasting of the fact that his Department showed a lifetime profit, instead of a loss. However, when I checked with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, he confirmed my opinion that the reason why the Department could boast of the profit was the fact that the Department had deducted as the cost of its operations only the direct appropriations made by Congress, and had not taken into consideration the billions of dollars in the form of notes which had been canceled. In other words, the notes so canceled were credited as earnings accruing to the Corporation.

If the agricultural program cost this country $427,000,000 for one item and $32,000,000 for another item during the last year, let us tell the American people the truth; and if we are ashamed of it, let us repeal the law; or if we approve of what has been done, let us at least require that the figures be broken down according to the individual items, and not permit the Department to tell the taxpayers that it is operating at a profit or with a surplus. Certainly that is not a fact, because annually the Congress is canceling the notes of the Corporation.

Mr. President, I realize that if my amendment is adopted it will mean that either today or later an appropriation bill will come before the Senate providing exactly the same amount; but in that event I think it will be clear to the American people what they are paying for. After the people have that information, if they are in favor of making the payments they can agree to have them made; or if they are opposed to having the payments made they can register their opposition.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree with the Senator from Delaware that these losses should be made up in the form of direct appropriations. I merely wish there were some way by which we could also put into an appropriation bill the $8,300,000,000 of tax deferments which have been given to industry this year, so that the taxpayers could see what that item is costing them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the Senator from Vermont. I have asked for a breakdown of that item by the Department, by States and projects, because I think that, too, has gone far afield and should be pointed out to the American people. As soon as that information can be obtained—I understand that a statement on it is being submitted—I intend to place it in the RECORD, in order to show the taxpayers what the cost is, because it is amounting to billions of dollars.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe that information is available now, and I think it should be placed in the RECORD, so that the people will know exactly to whom they are contributing the $8,300,000,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have been told that the information is available, and I have requested it, but have not yet received it. I expect to receive it soon.

Mr. AIKEN. I have the information up to July 23. To my amazement, I found, last night, that the amount had grown to $8,300,000,000. That is virtually a subsidy to industry.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree fully with the Senator about that.

Mr. AIKEN. And it comes from the people who pay the taxes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think every one of these subsidies should be made in the form of direct appropriations, in dollars and cents, so that every taxpayer will know how much is being paid to any subsidized organization or group, whatever it may be.

Mr. President, I desire to read from the most recent monthly report issued by the Commodity Credit Corporation, dated April 30, 1951:

> The Commodity Credit Corporation showed a net gain of $237,716,718 for the first 10 months of the fiscal year 1951.

Mr. President, if we regard that statement as having any degree of accuracy at all—although I do not so regard it—it would indicate that a profit has been made from this operation. If that be so, and if there is any truth whatever in what Mr. Brannan says in his statement, he should be paying back to the Treasury the $237,000,000, instead of asking for an appropriation or note cancellation of $427,000,000. Either the Secretary of Agriculture has lied or else he does not need the money.

I think we should end this note cancellation process, and should make the Secretary of Agriculture request an appropriation, just as every other Government agency does.

So, I certainly hope the amendment will be adopted. As I said before, I am not saying that the amendment, if adopted, will constitute any saving at all, because I recognize that until such time as we modify the agricultural commodity support law, we shall have to make this payment anyway. However, I want the payment to be made in the form of a direct appropriation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator think it is quite fair, now that industry has the $8,300,000,000, to "take it out" on agriculture, and to treat agriculture differently from the way industry is treated?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not suggesting "taking anything out" on agriculture. I wish to say to the Senator from North Dakota that I voted against the subsidies for industry as well as the subsidy for agriculture, because I think the time has come when we must stop such subsidies.

I agree with what the Senator from Vermont said, namely, that the subsidy to agriculture is not half so bad as some of the subsidies which are being given to industry—for instance, to the American shipping lines, the aircraft lines, and some of the other industries which could be enumerated. However, the fact that there is a wrong in one place does not just perpetuating a wrong in another place. Therefore I am in favor of striking out all such items straight across the board.

However, my amendment does not raise the question of paying the funds; it raises the question of telling the American people what we are paying.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I sympathize with the Senator's purpose. However, does he think it is fair and right and proper for us to legislate in such a way as to treat industry in one manner and to treat agriculture in another?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I am proposing that all of them be treated in the same manner and that every subsidy be shown above the board.

Mr. LANGER. We have already allowed the $8,300,000,000 to industry.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But we should have required that it be shown above the board. I think it was wrong to handle that matter in the way in which it was handled.

Similarily, we have already agreed to provide these funds for agriculture; but I say that we should show who is receiving the benefit and we should have this payment broken down by individual commodities, and thus stop "kidding" ourselves as to whether this agency is making any money or is not making any money.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the Senator from Delaware realize that in the case of industry, the matter to which he has referred is a tax deferment; and in the past 20 years any industry that has had its taxes deferred has paid more in taxes in the end, because the tax rates have constantly been rising. So it is not a subsidy; it is merely a postponement of the evil day.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the Senator, except I point out that most of the tax deferments were made during World War II, when there was the excess-profits tax. So the taxes which were deferred were deferred for payment in the postwar period.

There may be justification for the deferment; I am not discussing the merits of that question. However, if there is a justification for it, and if all of these projects are really essential to the national defense, then there is no reason for not setting them forth clearly, above the board; and no one should be ashamed of them, if they are justified. At this time I am not discussing the merits of the particular programs; I simply say let us not be ashamed of what they are costing us, if they are justified.

Mr. BENNETT. I feel that way, too; but I thought that I should state for the RECORD that in the case of industry it is a deferment, not an outright cash subsidy.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on the face of the report it is stated that the deferment is made for the purpose of enabling the various concerns to pay the full cost of construction over a 5-year period.

Mr. BENNETT. But that means that during the remainder of the period when the cost of construction of the buildings is being amortized, the industries do not have that opportunity.

Mr. AIKEN. When the Senator from Delaware places the report in the RECORD the facts and the amounts involved will all appear in print.

I realize that the argument of the Senator from Delaware is, not against the subsidies but to make the subsidies known to the public, so that the public will know what they are.

Undoubtedly I would support almost all of the Senator's points. However, I think the industrial situation should be kown, as well as the losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall yield later.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Delaware relinquish the remainder of his time?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, Mr. President; I reserve the remainder of my time, but at this point I yield the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am quite sure that no one who has been a Member of the Senate during the past 3 or 4 years could possibly be unfamiliar with the views of the Senator from Delaware regarding the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation. He is very much opposed to having a Commodity Credit Corporation. He is equally opposed to the loan program, the price-support program, and to all the works of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

If the Commodity Credit Corporation is to be stricken down, it should be done by the legislative committee which gave it life. If there is to be a change in the basic farm program, a bill should be introduced and sent to the standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for consideration. If the pending amendment should be adopted, it would injure the price-support program on wheat, corn, cotton, and other commodities, because it would place the capital structure of the Commodity Credit Corporation in a very dangerous position with respect to a considerable number of loans.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I disagree completely with what the Senator from Georgia has said, and I ask whether it is not a fact that, even now, the Commodity Credit Corporation has an unused reserve borrowing capacity of more than $3,000,000,000? Furthermore it would make absolutely no difference whether the action were taken in the form of a cash appropriation or in the form of a note cancellation, except that in the form of an appropriation it would be open and aboveboard. This in no way affects the agricultural program.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Delaware is not offering an amendment directed to the appropriation of funds. He is offering an amendment to nullify the efforts which have already been made to extinguish this deficit. Some very unwise things may have been done by the Department of Agriculture in dealing with the farm program. I am convinced that, in respect to certain commodities, notably potatoes, a number of errors have been made; but, since that time, the Congress has enacted new legislation on the subject, fixing standards, and endeavoring to prevent losses in the future.

The Senator from Delaware says that the Secretary of Agriculture should come before the committee and justify in detail, down to the last dollar, what appropriations he needs in order to deal with wheat, with corn, and with cotton. I submit that that is absolutely impossible, because no man can tell the amount of these commodities which the farmers will seek to place in loans made by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Senator from Georgia is completely off base, because the cancellation of the notes has absolutely nothing to do with the cost of the agricultural program next year. It is paying, in reverse, the cost of the program up to June 30 last year.

Mr. RUSSELL. If my ears did not deceive me, the Senator from Delaware stated, in the course of his argument, that the Secretary of Agriculture should be compelled to come before the com-

mittee to say how much he was going to need for each one of these commodities. I will leave it to the RECORD as to whether I am in error or not. If I am in error, the statement I made is not applicable.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If I did make that statement, I was in error. I had no intention of saying the Secretary should justify the needs in advance, because that would be physically impossible. But I do say that, if the Secretary of Agriculture comes to the Congress for an appropriation for the last fiscal year—which is exactly what this is—to make up a loss in the amount of $427,000,000, he should be able to break it down; otherwise there is no way to reconcile the figures with the statement which the Secretary makes in his own report, issued 60 days ago, from which I quote:

A net gain of $275,772,890 resulted from all program operations, after net reductions. * * *

That was for the first 10 months of the fiscal year 1951.

In one statement which he sends forth to the taxpayers, the American people, he says he has a net gain of $275,000,000 over all the appropriations for all the years; yet there is now a request for cancellation of $427,000,000 worth of notes to cover a loss. Those statements cannot be reconciled. They should be explained so that the truth may be disclosed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course the cancellation relates to the year 1950 and prior years. It is for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950. I am not here to defend the Secretary of Agriculture. He holds a great many views which I reject. I am here to undertake to see that no permanent damage is done to the farm program. I would not abolish the Department of Agriculture in order to get at the Secretary, however much I might be opposed to any individual who might fill the position of Secretary of Agriculture; and I certainly do not want the farm program injured because of any personal animosities or views of any Senator as to the capacity or as to the operations of the man who happens to be Secretary.

I have here, and I offer for the RECORD, a breakdown by commodities, showing the profit or loss on every commodity involved in the item now under consideration, which, as I said, is for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and preceding years. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

United States Department of Agriculture, Commodity Credit Corporation—Analysis of deficit for which restoration is proposed in 1952 budget

[Fiscal year ending June 30, 1950]

	Realized gain or loss (−)	Increase (loss (−)) or decrease (gain) in valuation reserves	Net gain or loss (−) included in deficit	Treasury appraisal (preliminary)	
				Adjustments of valuation reserves; increase (loss (−)) or decrease (gain)	Adjusted capital impairment
Price support program:					
Basic commodities:					
Corn	−$17,189,119	−$56,955,000	−$74,144,119	$72,935,056	−$1,209,063
Cotton	3,419,603	33,200,000	36,619,603		36,619,603
Peanuts	−40,592,600	1,912,000	−38,680,600	−34,797	−38,715,397
Rice	−1,293,780	9,700	−1,284,080		−1,284,080
Tobacco	195,495	360,000	555,495	5,974,000	6,529,495
Wheat	−28,384,123	−4,102,000	−32,486,123	6,336,677	−26,149,446
Total	−83,844,524	−25,575,300	−109,419,824	85,210,936	−24,208,888
Designated nonbasic commodities:					
Milk and butterfat:					
Butter	−4,111,861	−81,900,000	−81,011,861	53,889,982	−32,121,879
Cheese	−1,031,078	−15,550,000	−16,581,078	9,256,777	−7,324,301
Milk, nonfat, dry	−14,619,144	−38,900,000	−53,519,144	33,453,502	−20,065,642
Potatoes	−75,090,316	767,000	−74,323,316	−35,675	−74,358,991
Tung oil	31		31		31
Wool	−10,755,942	9,828,000	−927,942	31,000	−896,942
Total	−105,608,310	−125,755,000	−231,363,310	96,595,586	−134,767,724
Other nonbasic commodities:					
Barley	−2,608,937	−5,500,000	−8,108,937	9,187,936	1,078,999
Beans, dry edible	−880,329	−10,620,000	−11,500,329	13,192,576	1,692,247
Cotton, American-Egyptian		−103,000	−103,000	112,000	9,000
Cottonseed and products:					
Cottonseed	−529,472		−529,472		−529,472
Cottonseed oil:					
Crude	707,370		707,370		707,370
Refined	67,490		67,490		67,490
Cottonseed meal	−840,750		−840,750		−840,750
Cotton linters	−2,367		−2,367		−2,367
Eggs	−41,622,784	−56,819,850	−98,442,634	17,879,083	−80,563,551
Flax, fiber	−67,464	37,700	−29,764		−29,764
Flaxseed	−3,336,065	9,270,000	5,933,935	18,407,368	24,341,303
Fruit, dried	299,336	1,288,600	1,587,936		1,587,936
Linseed oil	−428,992	−56,042,000	−56,470,992	25,458,133	−31,012,859
Naval stores:					
Rosin	−34,436	−4,111,000	−4,145,436	−2,842,709	−6,988,145
Turpentine	−415,359	395,500	−19,859	−62,713	−82,572
Oats	−413,295	−705,000	−1,118,295	2,413,053	1,294,758
Peas, smooth, dry edible	−658,800	−289,000	−947,800	154,944	−792,856
Rye	−223,209		−223,209	−114,295	−337,504
Seeds:					
Hay and pasture	−71,708	−43,000	−114,708	4,817	−109,891
Winter cover crop	−2,319	−73,000	−75,319	−38,596	−113,915
Sorghums, grain	−10,514,934	−58,150,000	−68,664,934	44,537,957	−24,126,977
Soybeans	1,754,206		1,754,206	−20,550	1,733,656
Sweetpotatoes	1,453		1,453		1,453
Turkeys	44,458		44,458		44,458
Liquidation activities	−98		−98		−98
Total	−59,777,005	−181,464,050	−241,241,055	128,269,004	−112,972,051
Total, price support	−249,229,839	−332,794,350	−582,024,189	310,075,526	−271,948,663
Supply program	2,886,616		2,886,616		2,886,616
Foreign purchase program	49,006		49,006		49,006
Storage facilities program	−91,960		−91,960		−91,960
Commodity export program	1,753		1,753		1,753
Subsidy program (liquidation activities)	−113,351		−113,351		−113,351
Accounts and notes receivable	−86,113	−312,433	−398,546		−398,546
Total, all programs	−246,583,888	−333,106,783	−579,690,671	310,075,526	−269,615,145
Excess of other expenses over other income (interest, administrative expenses, etc.)	−48,030,688		−48,030,688		−48,030,688

United States Department of Agriculture, Commodity Credit Corporation—Analysis of deficit for which restoration is proposed in 1952 budget—Continued

[Fiscal year ending June 30, 1950]

	Realized gain or loss (−)	Increase (loss (−)) or decrease (gain) in valuation reserves	Net gain or loss (−) included in deficit	Treasury appraisal (preliminary)	
				Adjustments of valuation reserves; increase (loss (−)) or decrease (gain)	Adjusted capital impairment
Net loss for fiscal year 1950	−$294,614,576	−$333,106,783	−$627,721,359	$310,075,526	−$317,645,833
Deficit as of June 30, 1949			−170,515,131		−170,515,131
Total deficit as of June 30, 1950			−798,236,490	310,075,526	−488,160,964
Restoration of capital impairment as of June 30, 1949 per Treasury appraisal (accomplished)			66,698,457		66,698,457
Adjusted net deficit			−731,538,033	310,075,526	−421,462,507
Estimated capital impairment, 1952 budget estimate					427,000,000
Preliminary Treasury appraisal of capital impairment					421,462,507
Net reduction under estimate included in 1952 budget					5,537,493

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota, who was on his feet seeking to interrupt.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, if my memory serves me correctly, I think there was a net profit, as of last August, of approximately $53,000,000 in the operation of the price-support program, as it relates to basic commodities for the past 17 years. I was wondering what profit or loss there had been on basic commodities during the past year.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not have the figure, but, on the basic commodities, of course, substantial profits have been made, as the Senator indicates. The losses have been in other than basic commodities.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have not seen that report. Will the Senator tell me how much of a loss it indicates the CCC has sustained on those commodities?

Mr. RUSSELL. $427,000,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. $427,000,000?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, if they have lost more than $427,000,000, the statement of the Senator from North Dakota is wholly incorrect, is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, it is not at all incorrect. The Senator from North Dakota asked me about the basic commodities, and this item represents losses which were incurred on items other than basic commodities.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The over-all program showed a loss, and it should be broken down. I should like to see that report.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be very happy to have the Senator see it.

Mr. President, I think the amendment ought to be rejected. The matter has been handled for a number of years as we have provided in the bill. I have no objection to handling it as a direct appropriation, but I do object to striking out this item of the bill, and thereby causing complication of the farm program at this late date, when we are already about a month late in acting on this bill. The Department of Agriculture and the farmers should have some directive from the Congress as to the nature and scope of the program that is provided in the bill. The amendment ought to be rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Illinois wished to be heard.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Delaware yield time to the Senator from Illinois, and if so, how much time?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I desire to say to my friend from Georgia that it seems the Commodity Credit Corporation is certainly negligent in its failure to submit to the committees of Congress and to the public a type of operational sheet which makes plain exactly what its operations are and what the losses are. I have not seen the table presented by the Senator from Georgia, but I must say that I was reasonably diligent in pursuing the figures and the testimony before the Senate committee, and also before the House committee. One would have to be nothing short of a Philadelphia lawyer or a c. p. a. in order to be able, within a short period of 3 or 4 hours, to obtain a clear-cut picture of exactly what the situation is.

If we are to expect the people of the country to make up $427,000,000 of losses, it at least might not be so painful if they knew how much they had lost on peanut operations, and how much they had lost on potatoes, how much they had lost on eggs, how much they had lost on cheese and milk, and how much they had lost on any other item. I should like to know the facts. Industry issues a very simplified balance-sheet for its stockholders. It is printed, and it is published. It enables the stockholders to get a pretty fair bird's-eye view of the entire operation. The report now presented is so clouded in perplexity and prolixity of language that I think my friend from Georgia will well agree that there is something lacking; and, while I certainly would not charge the men in Commodity Credit Corporation with concealment, yet there is not enough there to meet the eye, to give a clear picture, either to the Congress or to the country. So I think there is real point in what the Senator from Delaware has suggested, which is that the item be stricken from the bill, and that the CCC justify their requests in language which is not quite so difficult to understand.

Perhaps I am rather obtuse in my perception, notwithstanding the fact that I have labored with this very item year after year for a good many years. It has not always been clear, and certainly it is not clear, in my judgment, from what has appeared in the hearings.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to make one further statement. I point out the confusion which exists in this entire program, and emphasize further the need of making all the details concerning this subject a matter of record.

I desire to point out further that both the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from North Dakota were laboring under the delusion that basic commodities had shown a profit, whereas the report which the Senator from Georgia has placed in the RECORD shows that $24,208,888 was lost on basic commodities.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield, but I do not have much time remaining.

Mr. YOUNG. I was speaking about the 18 years of operation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This is the first time there has ever been a breakdown of the whole program. I say again that when the Secretary boasted that there was an over-all profit for the Commodity Credit Corporation last year, it was by virtue of the fact that he counted as income the note cancellations. I think the entire record should be before us so that we may know exactly what it shows. The taxpayers paid $38,000,000 last year to support the price of peanuts. We pity the poor housewife because of high prices, and I think we

have a right to know why the prices are high and how much the Government is paying to destroy some food products so that their prices will continue to be high. The merits of the program have nothing to do with my amendment, and it in no way affects the agricultural-support program. I submit that the amendment should be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Delaware has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hennings	Moody
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Morse
Benton	Hill	Mundt
Bricker	Hoey	Nixon
Bridges	Holland	O'Conor
Butler, Md.	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Ives	Pastore
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Chavez	Kem	Saltonstall
Clements	Kerr	Schoeppel
Connally	Kilgore	Smathers
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Lodge	Sparkman
Dworshak	Magnuson	Stennis
Eastland	Malone	Taft
Ecton	Maybank	Underwood
Ellender	McCarran	Watkins
Ferguson	McCarthy	Wherry
Frear	McClellan	Wiley
Gillette	McFarland	Williams
Green	McKellar	Young
Hayden	Millikin	
Hendrickson	Monroney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. [Putting the question.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I offer my amendment designated "7-25-51—B," which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 54, line 24, after the word "exceed", it is proposed to strike out "497" and insert in lieu thereof "350."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in previous appropriation bills upon which the Senate has passed we adopted the policy of restricting the enormous number of Government automobiles. We did it by a sort of Jensen amendment, to provide that no addition to the total number of automobiles should be made, and that the total number should be reduced by replacing only half of the automobiles which wear out in the current year, thus effecting a painless reduction.

There is do doubt that so far as Washington is concerned, the Department of Agriculture, if I may coin a phrase, is "overautomobiled." In ancient Assyria it used to be said that the poor crouched by the wayside while the rich rode by in their chariots. Certainly it is true in the city of Washington that the average citizen either walks on the sidewalk or travels in a humble Ford car while the host of Government top officials ride by in Cadillacs, Lincolns, Pontiacs, and Buicks. The ordinary citizens do not precisely crouch by the wayside while the chariots of the great go by; but they do see the expensive Government cars being driven around, at the expense of the taxpayer.

We can make a large reduction in the number of Government automobiles in the Department of Agriculture in Washington. I know that in the field it is necessary for the agents of the Department of Agriculture to have automobiles, but again and again attention has been called to the duplication of the county units and county agencies of the Department of Agriculture. Not only are there county agents in the Extension Service, jointly financed by local governments and by the Federal Government, but there are Production and Marketing agents, Soil Conservation agents, rural electrification agents, farm home and production agents, and so forth. I know of relatively small counties which have no less than six or seven such agents.

The Secretary of Agriculture is entitled to some credit, because in the past year he has been attempting to house the various county agencies of the Department of Agriculture in a common office. However, he has not eliminated the excessive number of agents, and there is still an excessive number of automobiles. I am being most moderate in not trying to cut the replacements in half, but merely to reduce them by a fourth. I have made this concession because many of these automobiles will be for use in the field.

I very much hope that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee will not only accept this amendment and will take it to conference, though not in the usual senatorial fashion. I hope he will not take it to conference in order to abandon the baby and let it die of suffocation inside the conference committee room, but that he will struggle with all the vigor and ability he has to reduce the number of automobiles.

I look expectantly at him, and I hope for a very favorable response.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this amendment having been adopted in connection with other bills, it had been my intention to accept it and take it to conference. However, I did not wish to deny the distinguished Senator from Illinois the privilege of making his very eloquent statement about it.

I point out that the Department of Agriculture is not the chief sinner in respect to automobiles in the District of Columbia. I experience the same irritation which all other citizens feel from time to time in being almost run down on the street by large limousines bearing United States Government tags. However, it so happens that the Department of Agriculture has only 17 automobiles in the District of Columbia.

The Senator from Illinois referred to the large number of Cadillacs and Lincolns. Only one of the 17 in the Department of Agriculture comes within that class. That is the one assigned to the Secretary of Agriculture himself. According to the chart I have, he has a Cadillac.

Mr. President, I wish to go along with the spirit of the Senate. It has voted to reduce the number of automobiles. I am therefore willing to take this amendment to conference. I assure the Senator from Illinois that I shall bring to the attention of the conferees the very strong statement which he has made with respect to this item, and will express it as the view of the Senate on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, at this time I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I call the attention of the minority leader particularly to the fact that I appreciate the clarification which was placed in the RECORD yesterday on pages 9168 and 9169, with respect to the item of $10,351,400 for research.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Kansas suspend for a moment? Does the Senator from Nebraska yield time to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as I understand we have had the third reading of the bill. There are no further amendments to be offered. Now we are in the stage of discussing the bill itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. Thirty minutes are allowed to each side. The Senator from Nebraska controls 30 minutes of the time.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to yield a few minutes to the distinguished Senator from Kansas, but not to oppose the bill. I have received no request from any Senator for time in opposition to the bill. If any Senator wishes time in opposition to the bill I shall be glad to yield time to him. However, the Senator from Kansas is very much interested in asking some questions with respect to research in connection with wheat mosaic. He would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee a few questions. I am very hopeful that the conferees will see to it that the appropriation provided for this purpose by the Senate remains in the bill, and that it

will not be cut further. In Kansas and other wheat-producing States the farmers are apprehensive about the research program. I told the Senator from Kansas that I would be glad to give him time on the bill in order that he might make a few observations and ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee a few questions relative to the appropriation.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nebraska. I had spoken to him previously on the subject.

As I stated, I commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Georgia, for clarifying, to my way of thinking, a very important phase of the research provisions of the bill, including research activities in connection with wheat mosaic disease and the green bug situation.

I observe that this is an unbudgeted item, and it would be subject, of course, to being stricken out. It might be one of the first things to be eliminated when the bill goes to conference, but it is a very important item, and should remain in the bill. I hope that, in connection with the research items, the conferees will do everything they can to hold fast to the designated amounts for research, because Kansas has suffered, as other States have suffered, the ravages of the new diseases which are moving in, such as wheat mosaic and the green-bug plague.

I ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia whether it is the intention that the amounts for these research items shall by all means be given preferential status in the event the Senate conferees may have to recede on certain items. I may be asking a question which is out of line, but I think the Senator understands my point.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not believe that the distinguished Senator from Kansas was on the floor of the Senate—I believe he was called off the floor yesterday while we were discussing the item—when I stated my views fully on the subject, and they appear in the RECORD. I have not read the RECORD this morning, but I am sure they appear fully in the RECORD. There cannot be any question about the correctness of the Senator's position as to the importance of the work. I may say that on the conference committee there will be, in addition to the Senator from Georgia, who is extremely sympathetic, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], who has been promoting research into wheat mosaic, the stem sawfly, and the green bug for a number of years, and also the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. I can assure the Senator from Kansas that a determined effort will be made to see to it that the research work will be conducted as the Senate has indicated it should be.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I thank the Senator.

SEIZURE AND CONFINEMENT OF WILLIAM N. OATIS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, yesterday I addressed a letter to the President of the United States which I should like to read into the RECORD at this point for the information of the Senate. It reads:

JULY 26, 1951.

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Together with many other Americans in and out of Congress, I have been exceedingly disturbed over the seizure and confinement of Mr. William N. Oatis by the Government of Czechoslovakia. Recent press reports indicate that the Government of Czechoslovakia has rejected a note sent by our Department of State dealing with his release. It seems that they are about to use the same tactics with Mr. Oatis that the Government of Hungary used in the case of Mr. Robert Voegler.

Apparently the Communist-dominated governments feel that American citizens can be seized with impunity and that while we might officially lodge protests no effective and affirmative action will be taken by us. The longer we allow this impression to exist, the more apt the Communist-dominated governments are to continue to seize and hold Americans as hostages or for other purposes.

I would suggest that the Department of State be immediately instructed to advise the Government of Czechoslovakia that section 5 of Public Law 50, Eighty-second Congress "An act to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes" will be immediately implemented by withdrawing all reductions in any rate of duty which has been granted. Since there is no question but that the Government of Czechoslovakia is dominated or controlled by the world Communist movement there are no reasonable grounds why such action could not and should not be immediately taken.

In addition to the above, I would also suggest that the Department of State and/or Department of Commerce be immediately instructed to withhold expert licenses to Czechoslovakia in implementing their ability to make war.

If the above action is followed out, I believe that the economic hardship which Czechoslovakia will suffer, will be such that she will release Mr. Oatis. It will also serve notice on all Communist satellite countries that this Nation will no longer stand idly by and allow our citizens to be kidnaped, held, and tried on trumped-up charges by a star chamber proceeding, which apparently cannot stand the light of day.

Sooner or later, this issue must be met head-on, and I believe that this is the time and Mr. Oatis is the case.

If immediate results are not achieved by the above steps, I urge that this Government withdraw all diplomatic representatives from Czechoslovakia and that all their diplomats be sent home.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

PROPOSED JOINT MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS AND COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, at this point I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] whatever time he may desire to take.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia a question on another matter. I know he is working on a subject which will keep him out of the city for a day or two. The Committee on Armed Services yesterday considered the question whether it should sit jointly with the Committee on Foreign Relations in the consideration of aid to Europe.

I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia, inasmuch as the hearings are now in progress before the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Secretary of State having been heard yesterday and the Secretary of Defense today, what arguements, if any, he has made with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations in order to permit the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations to sit jointly. If the two committees do not sit jointly, in justice to ourselves as Members of the Committee on Armed Services, when the bill is reported to the Senate, we shall have to ask that it be referred to the Committee on Armed Services for further study, in order that we may familiarize ourselves with the armament situation, which is a vital part of our work.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, pursuant to the understanding reached in the Committee on Armed Services yesterday, I discussed the matter with the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I deem it unnecessary to go into the details of the private conference between us. However, I may say that about the only thing that was accomplished was that an invitation was extended to the members of the Committee on Armed Services to attend the hearings of the Committee on Foreign Relations as guests of that committee.

In view of the fact that the initial measure providing for the military aid program under the North Atlantic Treaty was handled by the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services sitting as a joint committee, and the further fact that the second authorization for that purpose was likewise handled by the two committees sitting as a joint committee, I was certain that the outcome of the conference would not accord with the wishes of the Members of the Committee on Armed Services, as expressed at the meeting of the committee yesterday morning. I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I apprised the Senator from Texas of the fact that the Committee on Armed Services felt that the program, relating as it does to the distribution of vast quantities of ammunition and other matériel of war of great value to the national defense, was certainly a matter which deeply concerned the Committee on Armed Services. It has a very definite relationship to our own arms program, in addition to its effect on the North Atlantic Treaty states.

I therefore advised the Senator from Texas that the Committee on Armed Services would request that the bill be referred to the Committee on Armed Services after it had been reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, in order that we may examine the arms features of the proposed legislation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia, I understand, agrees with me that it is an integral part of our work, and he takes the same position I take? I see that the Senator from Texas has come on the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thought I had made it perfectly clear that that was my position, and that I had so stated to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to commend the able chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], for a very clear statement on the subject. As one who has supported the arms-implementation program, both in its original form and in subsequent legislation, I believe it would not be beneficial to the expeditious handling of the matter to deny the Committee on Armed Services equal representation at the hearings on the bill. As the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has pointed out, of the $8,000,000,000 involved approximately $6,000,000,000 deals with the arms features, which directly tie into the materials now possessed by the United States Air Force, the United States Army, and the United States Navy, large quantities of which, under the arm-limitation legislation, both present and proposed, will be transferred from the armed services of the United States to our allies overseas.

I do not believe that the Armed Services Committee can discharge its obligation to the Senate unless it either sits in now in the original hearings on the bill or unless the bill is referred, when it comes from the Foreign Relations Committee, to the Armed Services Committee, so that it can give the bill the study, from its point of view, which legislation of such importance should receive.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me 5 minutes?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. As one who is especially interested in the agricultural appropriation bill, I wish to join in congratulating the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the chairman of the subcommittee, who handled the bill in the committee hearings and also has handled the bill on the floor of the Senate. I know of the pressing work in which he has been engaged since the first of the year. I know that he was held in the MacArthur hearings until a very late date, and had to postpone the consideration of this bill.

Yet, in spite of the complications and the many technical subjects involved, the Senator from Georgia was able to get the bill out of committee within the short span of a few weeks, and he has handled the bill in really an amazing fashion on the floor of the Senate. One with less knowledge of the bill itself and with less knowledge of the background of the subject matter could not have done what he has done in twice the time. We owe the Senator from Georgia a debt of gratitude which I am sure all of us feel, and wanted that sentiment to be expressed here, even in the rush of the moment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Mississippi will permit me to say from the bottom of my heart, "Thank you," for that very high compliment. I only wish I deserved half of it.

Mr. STENNIS. I am sure the Senator from Georgia deserves it, and much more, too.

Mr. President, I wish to say just a word in reference to the item on page 25 of the bill, "State and private forestry cooperation," for which the sum of $10,750,000 has been provided. I think that is one of the most important items in the entire bill; and the program for which it provides, as it is being developed, is one of the most beneficial.

I requested that the amount of the appropriation for the item be increased to $13,000,000. The subcommittee did not see fit to follow that suggestion, and I yielded for the time being to the judgment of the subcommittee. However, I wish to point out that this program is a growing program. I know from personal experience that it is operating in a most effective way. It affords a fine example of local cooperation. Some of the money comes from local funds, some comes from State funds, some comes from Federal funds, and some comes from the private, local owners of timberland.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I know that a few years ago the general rule in Mississippi among those who purchased timberland was to get as much from it as they could, and to cut down the timber with an entire disregard for the future of the crop. That attitude is gradually changing. Through this program, many of the buyers are purchasing the timber and cutting it on a systematic basis, utilizing it at its top capacity, and also leaving the growing stand in proper order for the benefit of future generations. That is where the big pay-off of the program comes.

Generally speaking, we have taken our forests for granted; but we certainly must realize that timber is an important crop which requires special research, planning, and marketing, so that timber operations will be carried out in such a way as to assure a continuous yield.

I understand that approximately only 30 percent of the money which is being used for this program is provided by the Federal Government, so certainly it is not a "grab" program, but is one in which there is the right kind of Federal leadership, with a proper view of the national picture as a whole, supplemented by local support. The main pay-off comes in connection with the training and the leadership the program gives to the local landowners, those who purchase the timber, those who own it, and also, as I have said, those who grow it.

I predict for this program a very fine future; and I feel sure that as the program develops, Congress will support it more and more earnestly, and will permit it to take its natural course and to develop as it should develop with resulting great benefit to the national welfare and the national economy.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to call attention to another matter, Mr. President. I have been downstairs in the Appropriations Committee in conference with the House conferees on the Interior Department appropriation bill; I was there until a few minutes ago.

There is in the pending appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture an item in which I am interested, and one about which the Appropriations Committee instructed the chairman of the subcommittee to allow an amendment to be submitted.

While I was downstairs, the third reading of the bill was had. Nevertheless, I desire to submit the amendment which the committee instructed should be presented.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the third reading of the bill may be rescinded, in order that I may submit the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico requests unanimous consent that the order for the third reading of the bill be rescinded, in order that he may submit the amendment to which he has referred. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no objection, and I should like to accommodate the distinguished Senator.

Of course, the amendment will be subject to the same time limitation that has applied to other amendments, namely, 15 minutes to each side.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFCER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? Without objection, it is so ordered, and the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Mexico will be stated by the clerk.

Mr. CHAVEZ. On instruction of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. President, I submit the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 41, after line 24, it is proposed to insert the following:

> The unexpended balances appropriated for the purposes of section 504 (a) of the Housing Act of 1949 by the General Appropriation Act of 1951, shall hereafter be available for the additional purposes of making grants and the grant portion of combination loans and grants for the purposes of the act of August 28, 1937, "to promote conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States by aiding in the development of facilities for water storage and utilization, and for other purposes."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, let me suggest to the Senate that this is a legis-

lative amendment. If it were not for the fact that I deem it absolutely necessary to submit the amendment at this time, I would not bother the Senate with it for even a few minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator feel that this amendment is any more important than the Wherry Housing Act?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree. We have tried for weeks to get that bill passed by the House of Representatives.

Although I am in entire sympathy with many of the provisions for housing which are desired, yet the so-called Wherry bill is in the House of Representatives, but the House will not consider it.

I understand that the conferees have even thrown out the control provisions.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Nebraska will not punish——

Mr. WHERRY. No; but I hope the House will not punish the Wherry Housing Act by insisting on the theory that the only good things are in the other housing bill.

I do not think this amendment is as important as continuing the Wherry Housing Act for the military installations.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I shall prove conclusively to my good friend the Senator from Nebraska that this amendment is more important than that.

Mr. WHERRY. It cannot be.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Why cannot it be?

Mr. WHERRY. I will tell the Senator why.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; let me speak now. I do not yield to my friend at this time. If he is trying to get even, well and good.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not trying to get even.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am trying to reason with the Members of this body.

Mr. WHERRY. Then let the Senator add the Wherry Housing Act at the end of the amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to explain the situation. Probably the kindness of the Senator from Nebraska will go with his judgment.

I have seen disasters. Last week the Senator from Michigan went with the members of the Committee on Public Works into the St. Louis, Cape Girardeau, Kansas City, and other areas which were devastated by the flood. There are disasters and disasters. Sometimes disaster results because there is too much water; sometimes because there is not enough. The latter is the difficulty in the present instance, and it affects the amendment which I have submitted.

New Mexico is experiencing perhaps the most critical drought condition in its history. If the Senator from Nebraska were ever compelled to exist without water; if he were ever to find that he had planted wheat, potatoes, or some other crop, to be used for food, and that, at the end of the season, not even the seed was forthcoming, he would then realize what we are passing through. In New Mexico we have very little water. The average annual rainfall is from 12 to 14 inches. In the past 10 months we have had 3 inches of rainfall throughout New Mexico. Is that a disaster, or is it not? Many, many farmers and ranchers are without adequate water supplies and facing a critical shortage of feed for their livestock.

The general water supply outlook on virtually all the principal rivers and tributaries is very unfavorable. Water levels in wells scattered throughout the central and southern portions of the State are at an all-time low.

Storage water in almost all of the large reservoirs in the State is at critical minimums. For instance, storage in El Vado Reservoir in northern New Mexico is 5,000 acre-feet, which is too low to sustain fish, even mountain trout, compared with 92,000 acre-feet a year ago, and a capacity of 200,000 acre-feet. The storage in Elephant Butte Reservoir in the southern part of the State is fast nearing the lowest level since the dam was built 30 years ago.

We have experienced drouth for the past 4 years. I am sure Senators know that when a rancher goes through four successive crop failures, whether the crop is wheat or beans, his ability to borrow is practically nil, because his ability to repay simply does not exist. Many of my fellow citizens in New Mexico have already reached the limit of indebtedness.

One of the great families of my State is the family of which Representative JENSEN, from Iowa, is a member. All the Jensen boys, with the exception of Representative JENSEN, live in my State. They have not produced a sack of beans in the past 4 years; nor has anyone else.

There is a very definite need of assistance to farmers and ranchers in New Mexico, and I am sure this situation exists in adjoining States. The same situation exists in western Colorado, and even in western Nebraska. There are several hundred farmers in New Mexico who are not in a position to finance the development of water supplies through the credit facilities which are commonly available. I believe in private credit, but I also believe in the common weal and in the public welfare of the people of this country; yet my people have no choice but to drill deeper wells for water for their families and their livestock. When the windmill ceases to produce water, the farmer must either bring in a new well or move.

I ask the do-gooders of this country and those who would do good throughout the entire world to listen to this: The Navajo Indian in my State and in the State of Arizona is now limited to 1 gallon of water a day, and it is murky.

The State of New Mexico has been declared a disaster area on a State-wide basis for purposes of loans, but even then restrictive language in the laws prohibits accomplishing the very goals which are so vital.

The amendment which I propose—and I want my good friends to listen to this—is a common-sense proposal, and, in common decency, common American fair play, and even charity, it should be adopted. The amendment I propose is not one of lasting benefit, but is merely an emergency stopgap to get a few fellow Americans over a very trying period. I would say what we are doing here is rescue work for people whose situation is every bit as pitiful as that of those in the flooded areas of Kansas and Missouri.

Mr. WHERRY rose.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If I may conclude this remark, I shall then be glad to yield to my good friend from Nebraska. The United States Government has always offered help to those people who suffer disaster of an immediate nature. Floods, earthquake, and explosion are instantaneous blows, and everyone's hearts are opened, but drought, as my friend from Nebraska knows, is a persistent and creeping paralysis which is often so slow that it fails to stimulate the reaction of a flood or like disaster. There is absolutely no difference in disaster of having either too much water or no water at all. Either means ruin. The Missouri Valley has more water than it can use. I wish we had it, for in New Mexico we have none at all. With one-tenth of the water which destroyed billions of dollars' worth of property and caused a loss of life in the Missouri River Valley, particularly in Kansas and Missouri, the farmers of New Mexico would be sitting on the top of the world. But at the moment we do not have even 1 percent of that amount of water.

Mr. President, I believe the Senate can see that it is most desirable that authority be provided for the making of loans for the development of facilities in these situations.

We are not asking for a direct appropriation. All I am asking of the Senate is a grant of funds which are already available. Let those funds be used for humanitarian purposes. That is all we ask. Make it possible for the man in the drought-stricken area of New Mexico at least to get a glass of water.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Why could not this amount be taken from the disaster fund which was voted by the Senate within the past few days, and the use of which is under the discretion of the President?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Because we do not want it as a matter of disaster relief. We do not want charity. We want to be in a position to help ourselves.

Mr. WHERRY. This is a grant and is not reimbursable; is not that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is reimbursable. It can be a reimbursable. Possibly, as a matter of strict necessity, it could be the subject of a grant, or it can take the form of a loan.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator is submitting this as a request for a loan, then I have entirely misinterpreted his amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It includes both features. I may say to the Senator from Nebraska, I know my people, whose families have resided in what is now New Mexico for 400 years, in spite of the elements. Knowing them as I do, I prefer to have this as a loan rather than as a grant.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator states for the RECORD that these funds are to be transferred, under the Housing Act of 1949, for the purposes he states, and if they are to be loans, not grants, it puts an entirely different aspect on the matter, in the opinion of the Senator from Nebraska. The situation in New Mexico could be met under the discretion which is vested in the President in connection with the administration of the disaster fund.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from New Mexico will say to the Senator from Nebraska that we prefer that the money be advanced in the form of loans.

Let me read the record——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have 15 minutes in opposition, and I am not going to say that I am in opposition, if I correctly understand the Senator's amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I had allotted time to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico on the bill because there had been a third reading, and he obtained consent to offer an amendment. I assume he has been speaking on the amendment in his own time. I have no control over that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has control of the time if he is opposed to the amendment. If he is not opposed to the amendment, then the Senator from Nebraska has control.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I desire to ask some questions of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall be delighted to try to answer them.

Mr. FERGUSON. On line 4 the amendment refers to making grants. That would indicate that it would be a total grant. Then follow the words "and the grant portion of combination loans and grants." That would mean part loan and part grant.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not see how it could be a complete grant.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is dependent upon the circumstances of each individual case.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the Senator wants to read something from the sideslip it may clear the matter up.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In the hearings, at page 450, Mr. Lasseter, Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration, testified as follows as to what could be done:

> Under the act of August 28, 1937, * * * which contains the basic authorization for the water facilities program, the following types of assistance which are not now provided might be made available if funds for such purposes were authorized:
>
> 1. The making of grants to farmers to install or repair facilities when the individual needing such facilities had little or no repayment ability.

That is, cases of extreme necessity.

> 2. The making of combinations of loans and grants to individuals with insufficient repayment ability to finance completely the installation or repair of needed water facilities, provided, the amount of such grants would not exceed that part of the cost of the facilities which could not be paid by the beneficiaries in an orderly manner from farm income.
>
> 3. The making of loans—

And this is the main part, so far as it applies in a practical way in my State—

> The making of loans for drilling exploratory wells with a written agreement providing that if such wells failed to develop a satisfactory water supply the borrower would repay only that part of the cost of the well determined to be within his repayment ability. In situations of this sort, it might be possible to cancel completely a loar if the wells which were drilled with loan funds were of no value and the borrowers had no repayment ability without the water which was expected from the wells.

Mr. FERGUSON. I suggest that if the Senator would strike out, in line 4, the words "for the additional purposes of making grants and," and insert "for the purpose of the grant portion of the combination loans and grants," there would be the combination about which the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] was speaking.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Irrespective of the hard condition of those poor people, I would be willing to make it even a loan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Loans and grants.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. We have suffered through the centuries. All we want is a chance to get a drink of water.

Mr. FERGUSON. What the Senator really wants is to drill wells, prospecting for water.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. And if they turn out to be satisfactory the Senator will expect full payment to be made. If the Senator provides loans and grants it will be a combination.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think that would be preferable.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what the Senator wants, anyway, is it not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator can modify his own amendment to that extent. Would the Senator be willing to do that?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes, I would.

Mr. FERGUSON. Do I correctly understand that the amendment is so modified?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to have the distinguished Senator from New Mexico advise me whether he is trying to steal some of the money I secured for the purpose of constructing toilets on farms about 2 years ago, for farmers living in submarginal areas.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; the Senator from New Mexico is not trying to steal one toilet. He is trying to make available a little money that can be borrowed by persons who need a drink of water.

Mr. LANGER. I sympathize with my distinguished friend, but where I live some of the farmers need toilets. An appropriation was made for that purpose. There is a balance left, and all of a sudden the Senator from New Mexico wants to take a quarter of a million dollars to secure drinking water.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not only for drinking water, but I told the Senate previously that there are disasters and disasters. I saw disasters resulting from too much water, and there can be disasters resulting from insufficiency of water. Knowing the kind-heartedness of my good friend from North Dakota, I know he would not object if he only knew the conditions.

Mr. LANGER. I object to taking away our money.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am not proposing to take away 1 penny from the Senator's State. Let me assure the Senator that it is not our purpose to take away 1 penny. Mr. Lasseter says it will not hurt anyone.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia whether there is a balance left in the appropriation which we secured for the purpose of helping farmers who needed toilet facilities.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is the fund appropriated for farm housing under the authorization which the Senator from North Dakota so vigorously espoused late one evening——

Mr. LANGER. That was the time the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from North Dakota had such a terrible time to get the poor farmers $500 grants.

Mr. RUSSELL. We were trying to get them into the housing program.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I raise the point of order that this amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration did say that the funds were so limited that he did not know how to start spending them.

Mr. LANGER. The toilets cost only $500 apiece.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think a human being, with all due regard to my good friend from North Dakota, is more in need of a glass of water than he is of a toilet, even in North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I raise the point of order, Mr. President.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that the rules of the Senate be suspended——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The Chair sustains the point of order that the amendment proposes legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Senator from New Mexico gave notice of his intention to make a motion to suspend the rule. The Senator can now make his motion.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I make the motion that the rule of the Senate be suspended, and that the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is any time left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion made by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] can be debated.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not true that on the motion the same time is allowed as

on an amendment, that is, 15 minutes to a side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Mexico to suspend the rule. The "noes" appear to have it; the "noes" have it, and the motion of the Senator from New Mexico is not agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for a division on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well. All in favor will rise and remain standing until counted.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I was busy talking to the Official Reporter. What happened?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question on agreeing to the motion to suspend the rule was put to a vote, and the negative vote prevailed. A division is now asked for.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am extremely sorry that I did not hear the question put to a vote, as I was busy talking to the Official Reporter.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, did the Presiding Officer announce the result of the vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the Chair announced that the "noes" had it.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not hear the Chair's announcement. I am perfectly willing to withdraw my request for a division.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I did not hear the Chair's announcement, because, as I said, I was talking to the Official Reporter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will put the question again.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division is called for.

On a division, the motion was not agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, how much time is left in control of the Senator from Nebraska on the passage of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Nineteen minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield whatever time the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] may desire to have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I desire to acquaint the Senate with the fact that I intend to ask for a record vote on the passage of the appropriation bill. I think it is absolutely necessary that such a vote be had. I wish that at some time the Senate would take some action on the resolution submitted by the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] which calls for a modification of the Senate rules so that a record vote on an appropriation bill will be mandatory. Hundreds of millions of dollars are involved in the bill before the Senate. I believe that the people of the United States who are expected to provide the money, and whose credit is pledged for that purpose, are entitled to know how their elected representatives stand upon the appropriations for various functions and agencies for which appropriations are made in the pending bill.

First, I want to pay a compliment, of course, to the Senator from Georgia, for the very masterly way and the eminently fair way in which he has handled the bill. I know over the years he has always informed himself with respect to any bill that comes within his jurisdiction.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to thank the Senator from Illinois for his kind statement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That compliment comes from the heart, because we have sat across the table from each other in conference committee sessions over the years, and I know that the Senator from Georgia prepares himself and does a very estimable job in connection with bills which are under his jurisdiction.

However, as a matter of conviction I part company with him as to the results which are finally to be achieved when the bill reaches the stage of final passage. I think it is rather regrettable that notwithstanding the fact that a large farm organization of the country, in fact the largest, endorsed a $130,000,000 cut in conservation payments, the Senate has not seen fit to go along with that recommendation.

Every Senator has advanced his own particular reason why he voted for or against the proposal which was considered yesterday, but I believe we ought to go on record in a matter of that kind, particularly when so much money is involved. So I simply say, Mr. President, that I shall ask for a record vote, despite the fact that it has probably not been consonant with the traditions of the Senate in other years to ask for such a vote on an appropriation bill. I believe that the people of the country are entitled to know, as we stand up and go on record, how we, the Members of the Senate, as well as those of the other body, stand, when economy is one of the most important challenges of this generation.

I yield back whatever time I have remaining.

Mr. WHERRY. I think all the time requested by the Senator from Nebraska has been exhausted. If no other Senator desires to speak, perhaps the Senator from Illinois would wish to request the yeas and nays on final passage.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, before that is done, and in my own time, I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement as to the work time required to buy food in various countries. The question was raised on that point the day the bill was first submitted to the Senate, and I assured two or three Members of the Senate that I would endeavor to secure information on that subject. I may say that the purchasing power of hourly earnings in terms of food of the average worker in the United States is some eight times what it is in Soviet Russia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement is as follows:

WORK TIME REQUIRED TO BUY FOOD, 1937–50

(Excerpts from the above study by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, published in the Monthly Labor Review, February 1951, U. S. Department of Labor)

Index numbers in the following table show the purchasing power of average hourly earnings in terms of food in each foreign country as a percentage of the food purchasing power in United States earnings. Another and equally valid interpretation of the indexes is that they express the work time required to buy food in the United States as a percentage of that required in each foreign country.

Indexes of purchasing power of hourly earnings in terms of food, prewar, 1949 and 1950

[United States=100]

Country	1950	1949	Prewar
Australia	107	109	92
Austria (Vienna)	28	26	38
Canada	78	84	86
Chile	37	36	26
Czechoslovakia	46	[1] 48	[1] 34
Denmark	73	80	73
Finland	39	49	49
France (Paris)	31	37	68
Germany	38	32	51
Great Britain	62	71	46
Hungary	27	33	29
Ireland	46	46	44
Israel	63	49	52
Italy	24	24	26
Netherlands	38	47	45
Norway	84	88	68
Sweden	63	68	60
Switzerland	46	51	49
U. S. S. R.	14	13	24

[1] Based on ration prices for 1950, on official prices for 1949, and on legal minimum wage rates in Prague, and Prague prices prewar.

According to the relative purchasing power of earnings in the different countries (end of 1949 and beginning of 1950), Australia was the only foreign country where less working time was required than in the United States to buy a given amount of food. Even in countries with such a high level of living as Canada, Great Britain, and Scandinavia (using United States=100), the work-time required to buy food ranged from 20 percent longer in Norway to 60 percent longer in Great Britain and Sweden. The time was relatively longer in the other countries. Among the nations covered, the purchasing power of hourly earnings was lowest in the USSR, where workers had to work seven times as long as those in the United States in order to buy a given quantity of food.

The food-purchasing power of hourly earnings was next lowest in Italy and Hungary; however, compared with the United States, the power of earnings to buy food in these countries was approximately 70 and 90 percent, respectively, higher than in the Soviet Union.

Both similarities and differences are apparent in the results of the studies made in the three periods. One common characteristic of the results in all three periods is the very wide variation in the purchasing power of hourly earnings in terms of food among the countries studies. Before the war, the highest index was less than four times the lowest, and in the postwar studies the gap had considerably widened. Another similarity is that all the indexes for the three periods, with the exception of those for postwar Australia, are lower than 100—indicating that since 1937 foreign earnings have consistently bought less food than United States earnings. Indeed, in each period, in the majority of the countries, earnings could buy only half, or less, as much food as United States earnings. Finally, the countries at both the top and bottom of the purchasing-

power scale tended to remain the same in all three periods.

The purchasing power of earnings was consistently lower in the Soviet Union—about a fourth as great as those of United States earnings in the prewar period and about a seventh as great in both postwar studies. In Italy, Hungary, Austria, and Chile workers have been able to buy relatively little food with an hour's earnings; the indexes for these countries ranged from 24 to 38 percent of United States purchasing power. Three or four other nations were within this range in one or two of the periods, but not in all three.

At the other extreme Australia, Norway, Canada, and Denmark consistently had the highest indexes of purchasing power relative to the United States. France was in this group in the prewar period, but its indexes for both postwar periods are much below the level of these four countries. In 1950 workers in Sweden, Great Britain, and Israel, on the other hand, moved up to positions immediately below those in the highest-purchasing-power group.

Minutes of working time required to earn enough to buy various foods in 19 foreign countries and the United States, selected periods, 1949–50

Country (and period)	Wheat flour	Pork chops	Butter	Eggs	Potatoes	Lard	Sugar and sweets
United States, March 1950	4	29	31	22	2	7	4
Australia, March 1950	4	29	30	52	3	----------	6
Austria, April 1950	12	[1]161	148	124	6	94	28
Canada, March 1950	4	36	39	29	2	12	6
Chile, December 1949	13	----------	167	105	6	108	13
Czechoslovakia, December 1949:							
Ration prices	8	58	93	92	2	70	17
Free market prices	8	[2]82	349	308	2	524	186
Denmark, October 1949	7	[1]33	57	61	2	35	4
Finland, March 1950	12	----------	106	74	3	49	17
France, April 1950	17	90	169	96	6	71	25
Germany, March 1950	11	88	129	105	4	----------	26
Great Britain, April 1950	7	----------	37	66	3	22	9
Hungary, May 1950	17	[1]100	160	106	4	133	40
Ireland, February 1950	6	[3]56	76	94	4	33	10
Israel, February 1950	8	----------	40	64	3	----------	8
Italy, April 1950	17	[1]120	183	102	8	66	43
Netherlands, January 1950	14	[1]103	163	128	4	66	23
Norway, November 1949	6	[1]42	58	75	3	----------	8
Sweden, February 1950	7	49	60	54	3	----------	9
Switzerland, April 1950	19	[3]89	117	76	5	39	12
U. S. S. R., April 1950	36	304	373	291	11	----------	122

[1] Average of all pork.
[2] Shoulder (United States working time, 19 minutes).
[3] Cutlets.

Source: Table 8 of Bureau of Labor Statistics study, Worktime Required To Buy Food, 1937–50, Monthly Labor Review, February 1951.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I inadvertently stated that all time allotted to me had been requested. I find that the Senator from Delaware wishes to speak for 2 minutes, and I yield 2 minutes to him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I will speak for only 2 minutes. I wish to join the Senator from Illinois in voting against the appropriation bill for two reasons. First, I think entirely too much money is being appropriated in the bill. I cannot understand how the Senate would appropriate twice as much money for some of the programs as the farmers themselves are asking for. I point out that as the bill was reported from the Senate committee, it indicated that it was calling for $751,000,000 appropriations this year. After 2 or 3 days of debate we have finally managed to adopt one amendment, reducing the amount by $2,000,000. Then last night we added back $76,000,000, which left us $74,000,000 worse off than if we had not debated the bill at all, but had passed it as it was reported from the committee.

In addition there is $427,000,000 by way of note cancellations, and another $32,000,000 by way of note cancellations, provided in the bill, which are exactly the same as appropriations, so far as the taxpayers are concerned and which is not included in the above total. This will give the Secretary of Agriculture a chance again to tell the American people how he is making money on this stupid program of destroying our good, edible food when in reality the loss is nearly $500,000,000. I think that is wrong. I think the item should be broken down to show exactly what each agricultural commodity is costing the Government to support it at today's level, and then if the people think it is worth it, they can pay for it accordingly.

I think the housewives in the cities who are being forced to pay high prices for these food products today should know that the administration whose representatives are shedding these crocodile tears are today asking the Congress for nearly $500,000,000 to pay for the destruction of food since the war broke out last June in Korea.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. WHERRY. All time either having been exhausted or relinquished, perhaps a request for the yeas and nays will be made, after which I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Clements	Ellender
Bennett	Connally	Ferguson
Benton	Cordon	Frear
Bricker	Dirksen	Gillette
Bridges	Douglas	Green
Butler, Md.	Duff	Hayden
Capehart	Dworshak	Hendrickson
Carlson	Eastland	Hennings
Chavez	Ecton	Hickenlooper
Hill	Maybank	Robertson
Hoey	McCarran	Russell
Holland	McCarthy	Schoeppel
Ives	McClellan	Smathers
Johnson, Colo.	McFarland	Smith, Maine
Johnson, Tex.	McKellar	Smith, N. C.
Kem	Millikin	Sparkman
Kerr	Monroney	Stennis
Kilgore	Moody	Underwood
Knowland	Morse	Watkins
Langer	Mundt	Wherry
Lehman	Nixon	Wiley
Lodge	O'Conor	Williams
Magnuson	O'Mahoney	Young
Malone	Pastore	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is a motion to recommit in order at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is in order at any time before the final passage of the bill.

The question is on the final passage of the bill. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Foreign Relations Committee.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from New

Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent by leave of the Senate on cfficial business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are absent by leave of the Senate to attend the funeral of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 6, as follows:

YEAS—65

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Benton	Hill	Moody
Bricker	Hoey	Morse
Bridges	Holland	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Johnson, Colo.	Nixon
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Carlson	Kem	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Kerr	Pastore
Clements	Kilgore	Robertson
Connally	Knowland	Russell
Cordon	Langer	Schoeppel
Douglas	Lehman	Smathers
Duff	Lodge	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Magnuson	Smith, N. C.
Eastland	Malone	Sparkman
Ecton	Maybank	Stennis
Ellender	McCarran	Underwood
Frear	McCarthy	Watkins
Gillette	McClellan	Wherry
Green	McFarland	Wiley
Hayden	McKellar	Young
Hennings	Millikin	

NAYS—6

Bennett	Ferguson	Ives
Dirksen	Hendrickson	Williams

NOT VOTING—25

Anderson	Humphrey	Neely
Brewster	Hunt	Saltonstall
Butler, Nebr.	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Taft
Cain	Kefauver	Thye
Case	Long	Tobey
Flanders	Martin	Welker
Fulbright	McMahon	
George	Murray	

So the bill (H. R. 3973) was passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. FERGUSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement heretofor entered into, the bill (H. R. 3282), making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, automatically comes before the Senate for consideration.

However, there are several messages from the House of Representatives which the Chair desires to lay before the Senate at this time.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO PROCEDURE IN CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 82) to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to add thereto a chapter relating to procedure in condemnation proceedings, which were: On page 1, strike out all after line 2 over to and including line 4 on page 11; on page 11, line 5, strike out "SEC. 4. Notwithstanding" and insert "That notwithstanding"; and on page 11, line 9, after "effective" insert "until April 1, 1952."

And to amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to postpone the effective date of amendments to the Rules of Civil Procedure for the United States District Courts."

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, the subject before us is of considerable moment. Unless the joint resolution is passed the rule of court involved will become effective at the end of this month.

I make the following motion with respect to the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate Joint Resolution 82:

First. Agree to the House amendments Nos. 1 and 2.

Second. Disagree to the House amendment No. 3.

Third. Agree to the amendment of the House to the title of the joint resolution with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the amended title as proposed by the House amendment, amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution providing that the amendments to the Rules of Civil Procedure for the United States District Courts reported to the Congress by the Supreme Court on May 1, 1951, shall not become effective."

Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 82 was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary to the Senate as an original committee resolution on July 9, 1951. In the consideration of this resolution the committee voted unanimously to reject the rule as reported by the Supreme Court to the Congress, and by another unanimous vote reported the joint resolution to the Senate. The rule, as reported and submitted by the Supreme Court, provided for a uniform procedure relating to conduct and trial of condemnation proceedings. While the committee was of the opinion that the rule was meritorious, it had objection to section (H) of that rule, which gave the Court the discretion to determine whether or not the issue of just compensation in a condemnation proceeding should be tried before a jury or given to commissioners for that purpose. In other words, there was no right of trial by jury provided for the parties thereto should they make such a demand.

In order to attempt to carry out the intent of the Supreme Court insofar as it was compatible with the views of the Congress, the committee in Senate Joint Resolution 82 set forth all of the rule as submitted by the Supreme Court with the objectionable feature just referred to omitted therefrom, so that a jury trial could be had upon the request of any of the parties. As stated, this resolution was only an effort to carry out what the committee believed to be the intention of the Supreme Court. On July 11, 1951, the joint resolution was unanimously passed by the Senate.

The first amendment of the House to Senate Joint Resolution 82 will delete from the resolution all of the matter the Senate passed in order to carry out the intention of the Supreme Court, and under such amendment the laws relating to condemnation proceedings will remain as they have been and now are in effect. It is my feeling that the Senate can agree to this amendment for the reason that under present law in at least 41 States the right of jury trial and condemnation proceedings is afforded.

The second amendment of the House is technical in nature and has no bearing upon the merits of the joint resolution. Therefore, it is my opinion that the Senate should concur therein.

The third House amendment to the joint resolution simply postpones the effective date when the rules as submitted by the Supreme Court would go into effect. They will go into effect, under that amendment on April 1, 1952, unless there be another congressional enactment before that date. This also means that there shall be before the Congress until April 1, 1952, rules which have been reported by the Supreme Court. In my opinion, this will tend to hamstring the Court from submitting substitute rules after it has had an opportunity to reexamine the objections raised to the present rule. In additon to that feature, it is my opinion that merely postponing the effective date of the rule is tantamount to approving the rule as submitted, which in principle is in variance with the recorded desires of the Committee on the Judiciary, when it voted unanimously to reject the rule as submitted.

My motion on this amendment of the House is to disagree. If the House will recede from this amendment, the result will be that the rule will not become effective on August 1, 1951, which will leave the way clear for the Supreme Court under the law to submit another rule of procedure in condemnation proceedings on or before May 1, 1952, which is only 1 month later than the effective date of the rule as proposed by the House amendment.

The amendment to the title of the joint resolution simply reflects what will be the effect of the joint resolution in the event the House recedes from the amendment, which is proposed to be disagreed to by the Senate.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move the adoption of the motion I have heretofore made, namely, that the Senate agree to House amendments Nos. 1 and 2, that the Senate disagree to House

The following-named person to be a chief pay clerk in the United States Coast Guard:

William E. Sparks

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Hugh Meglone Milton 2d, O154541, United States Army Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Charles Edward Hart, O15788, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Riley Finley Ennis, O11854, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Nicholas Young, O15068, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Sherman Timberman, O15328, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Clyde Davis Eddleman, O15342, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Leonard Harrold, O16051, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Robert Alwin Schow, O12180, United States Army.

Col. Herbert Maury Jones, O12251, United States Army.

Col. Alfred Eugene Kastner, O14932, United States Army.

Col. Gilman Clifford Mudgett, O14966, United States Army.

Col. Charles Lanier Dasher, Jr., O15634, United States Army.

Col. Marcus Butler Stokes, Jr., O15613, United States Army.

Col. Joseph Pringle Cleland, O16239, United States Army.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be brigadier generals, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. Earle Standlee, O16530, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Edward Shambora, O16540, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be brigadier generals

Col. Don Longfellow, O16708, Medical Corps, United States Army.

Col. Martin Eugene Griffin, O16537 Medical Corps, United States Army.

Col. Alvin Levi Gorby, O16546, Medical Corps, United States Army.

Col. James Ogilvie Gillespie, O16711, Medical Corps, United States Army.

The following-named officer for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be brigadier general, Dental Corps

Col. Neal Anthony Harper, O4025, Dental Corps, United States Army.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 13 (legislative day of August 1), 1951:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be medical director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel), effective date of acceptance

Wilton L. Halverson

To be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

James J. Callaway
Seymour Levine
Francis T. Flood
William P. Galen
Gerald W. Labiner
Ernest C. Siegfried
Nicholas L. Petrakis
Robert Schwartz
John S. Shuttleworth
Cleve B. Vaughan, Jr.
Page H. Seekford
John D. Talbert
Elaine A. Schwinge
Ernest D. Carlson
William M. Lordi
James F. Alexander
Sherman N. Kieffer
Charles S. McCammon
Robert A. Mayer
Rodrique A. Gravelle
Sidney J. Curran
Eugene J. VanScott
Charles J. Cherre
Vincent J. DePaulo

To be assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

David C. Miller
Allan B. Carter
Frank L. Weaver, Jr.
Clayton R. Haberman
Warren H. Proudfoot
David J. Crosby
Melvin R. Davis
Margaret S. Spies
Leonard A. Lewis
Cameron L. Self
Donald W. Tharp
Bernard G. Keizer
Gordon F. Wise

To be senior assistant sanitarian (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Harold Lyons

House of Representatives

MONDAY, AUGUST 13, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever blessed God, we thank Thee for this moment of prayer set apart for communion with the great Companion of our souls and the Counselor of our minds.

May we always feel the presence and power of Thy divine spirit, and begin each new day with the prayer, "What wilt Thou have me be and do?"

Grant that we may be inspired to give our best for the most helpful and noblest ways of serving our country and all mankind.

Make us trustworthy and faithful, as we aspire to stand in the glorious tradition of those who sought to do justly, loved mercy, and walked humbly with the Lord.

Hear us in the name of the Christ, our Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 10, 1951, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 311. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1952.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1214. An act to authorize and direct conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Florida to the St. Augustine port, waterway, and beach district.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 3973, an act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WHITTEN, STIGLER, BATES of Kentucky, H. CARL ANDERSEN, HORAN, CANNON, and WIGGLESWORTH.

SUSPENDING IMPORT DUTIES ON LEAD

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4948) to suspend certain import duties on lead.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman kindly explain the bill for the benefit of the House.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, this bill suspends the import duties on lead from the day following enactment of the bill until the close of March 31, 1953, or the termination of the present national emergency. The bill also contains a proviso whereby the President is required to revoke the suspension of duties when, for any one calendar month, the average market price of common lead delivered at New York, has been below 16⅞ cents per pound.

The ceiling price on domestic lead is now 17 cents per pound. Since the outbreak of hostilities in Korea in June 1950, the demand for lead in this country and in the world at large has increased rapidly. This has resulted in a shortage of lead. The United States depends on imports of lead for about one-third of its current requirements.

While the suspension of duties on lead will still not permit United States importers to meet the world price of lead, it is believed that imports will be increased and shortages alleviated to some extent due to the desire of foreign producers to earn dollars and to create or preserve their markets in this country.

It is believed that there will continue to be a shortage of lead in this country for the duration of the suspension under this bill. However, in order to protect domestic producers in the event of unforeseen circumstances which may alleviate the present shortage, the bill contains the above-mentioned proviso requiring the President to revoke the suspension of duties.

The Departments of State, Commerce, and Defense, the Treasury Department, the Office of Defense Mobilization, and the Economic Cooperation Administration, all support legislation which would suspend the import duties on lead.

(Mr. MILLS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD explaining a little further the purposes of this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H. R. 4948 is to suspend the import duties on lead-bearing ores, flue dust, and mattes of all kinds, lead bullion or base bullion, lead in pigs and bars, lead dross, reclaimed lead, scrap lead, antimonial lead, and antimonial scrap lead, which duties are imposed under paragraphs 391 and 392 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

The suspension would apply beginning with the day following the date of enactment of the bill and ending with the close of March 31, 1953, or the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, whichever is earlier.

The bill also contains a proviso whereby the President shall revoke the suspension of duties when, for any one calendar month, the average market price of common lead for that month, delivered at New York, has been below 16⅞ cents per pound.

Since the outbreak of hostilities in Korea in June 1950, the demand for lead in the United States and in the world at large has increased rapidly. As a result of this demand, domestic lead prices have risen from 11 cents per pound on June 28, 1950, to 17 cents per pound on January 1, 1951. The Economic Stabilization Agency froze the price of domestic lead at 17 cents per pound and of imported lead at 18½ cents per pound on January 26, 1951.

In 1950 consumption of lead in the United States was 1,220,000 tons, production was 429,875 tons, and 366,500 tons of lead were recovered from scrap. It is estimated by the trade that the United States mine output for 1951 will be somewhat higher than the output of 429,875 tons in 1950, and that the recovery of lead from scrap will be close to the 366,500 tons in 1950.

This country is dependent on imports of lead for approximately one-third of its current requirements. In 1950 imports amounted to 565,152 tons. Since the beginning of 1951, imports of lead have fallen considerably. During January and February imports averaged 22,000 tons per month, compared with average monthly imports of 47,000 tons during 1950. During these same months consumption of lead continued at the same high rate attained in the last half of 1950.

In order to conserve supplies of lead for defense production, the National Production Authority issued Order M-38, on April 3, 1951, restricting consumers of lead to 100 percent of their average monthly consumption in the first 6 months of 1950, effective May 1, 1951. This order also prohibits consumers of lead from holding in inventory more than

82D CONGRESS 1st Session } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT No. 886

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

AUGUST 16, 1951.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. WHITTEN, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 3973]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 13, 32, 43, and 66.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 5, 9, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 23, 27, 28, 29, 31, 33, 34, 38, 39, 40, 41, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 56, 57, 59, 61, 62, 63, 64, and 70, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$4,750,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$2,150,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$50,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$12,428,708*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$3,250,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$1,475,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$7,250,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$3,650,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$4,600,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$27,322,025*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$13,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$75,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$125,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$235,500*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$260,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$256,500,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$27,825,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$850,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$2,025,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$575,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$550,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment insert:

Sec. 409. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: Provided, That this inhibition shall not apply—

(a) to not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;

(b) to positions filled from within the department;

(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advise and consent of the Senate;

(d) to seasonal and casual workers;

(e) to meat inspectors;

(f) to field employees of the Soil Conservation Service and Production and Marketing Administration who provide conservation assistance to farmers and ranchers;

(g) to field operating and research employees engaged in work of county offices and other field locations;

(h) to employees of the crop and livestock reporting service:

Provided further, That with the exception of the agencies and functions listed in (a) to (h) above, not more than 90 per centum of the amounts shown in the budget estimates for personal services shall be available for such purpose: Provided further, That when the total number of personnel subject to this section has been reduced to 90 per centum of the total provided for in the budget estimates for 1952, this section may cease to apply: Provided further, That in addition to the funds otherwise allowed under this section, the following agencies shall be allowed additional sums for personnel as follows: Commodity Exchange Authority, $58,928;

Extension Service, salaries and expenses, $31,327; Office of the Secretary, $32,832; Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, $26,946.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

Sec. 411. Except for the car officially assigned to the Secretary of Agriculture, no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government whose principal duties consist of acting as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle (other than a bus or ambulance), unless such appropriation is specifically authorized to be used for paying the compensation of employees performing such duties.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

Sec. 412. No part of the money appropriated for the Department of Agriculture by this Act or made available for expenditure by any corporation by this Act which is in excess of 75 per centum of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952 contemplated would be employed by the Department of Agriculture or by such corporation, respectively, during such fiscal year in the performance of—

(1) functions performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title, or

(2) functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions described in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating public information publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion pictures, and similar material,

shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing the functions described in (1) or (2): Provided, That this section shall not apply to personnel engaged in the preparation and distribution of technical agricultural publications and farmers bulletins, and the Agriculture Yearbook, the reporting and dissemination of the results of research and investigations, the preparation and broadcasting of the "Farm and Home Hour" and similar radio programs, and other work required to carry out the duties and responsibilities of the Department imposed by law other than work intended primarily for press, radio and television services, and popular publications.

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 21, 30, 42, 60, and 67:

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM G. STIGLER,
JOE B. BATES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
PAT MCCARRAN,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
HOMER FERGUSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Research and Marketing Act

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $4,750,000, instead of $4,700,000 as proposed by the House and $4,850,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Amendment No. 2—*Economic investigations:* Appropriates $2,150,000, instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House and $2,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3—*Crop and livestock estimates:* Appropriates $2,848,304 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,850,000 as proposed by the House.

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $541,440 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $560,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 5: Inserts language proposed by the Senate providing for the alteration of a building at Greenfield, Mass., at a cost not to exceed $7,500.

RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $250,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $261,550 as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8—*Payments to States, etc.*: Authorizes $50,000 for research in Alaska, instead of $37,500 as proposed by the House and $52,500 as proposed by the Senate, and appropriates a total of $12,428,708, instead of $12,416,208 as proposed by the House and $12,431,208 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9—*Salaries and expenses:* Appropriates $367,090 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $390,000 as proposed by the House.

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

Amendment No. 10—*Animal research:* Appropriates $3,250,000, instead of $3,200,700 as proposed by the House and $3,320,700 as proposed by the Senate. The $49,300 authorized above the amount proposed by the House is to be used for research on infectious and noninfectious diseases.

Amendment No. 11—*Animal disease control and eradication:* Appropriates $7,731,022 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $7,750,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 12—*Marketing agreements, hog cholera virus and serum:* Appropriates $47,906 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $49,300 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 13—*Meat inspection:* Restores language proposed by the House which permits reimbursement for meat-inspection work required beyond that which can be met from appropriated funds.

BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

Amendment No. 14—Appropriates $1,475,000, instead of $1,450,000 as proposed by the House and $1,491,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that the dairy work at Mandan, N. Dak., and Woodward, Okla., should be continued within the funds provided.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

Amendment No. 15—Appropriates $7,250,000, instead of $7,200,000 as proposed by the House and $7,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

Amendments Nos. 16 and 17—*Plant, soil, and agricultural engineering research:* Appropriate $10,589,730 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $10,351,400 as proposed by the House and authorize construction of a laboratory at Orlando, Fla. The additional funds provide $9,000 for onion research work and $40,000 for research on wheat mosaic. The $275,000 authorized for the laboratory at Orlando represents the full Federal contribution for the construction of this facility and not necessarily the full cost.

Amendment No. 18—*National Arboretum:* Appropriates $136,920 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $148,600 as proposed by the House.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

Amendment No. 19—*Insect investigations:* Appropriates $3,650,000 instead of $3,525,000 as proposed by the House and $3,797,725 as proposed by the Senate. The increase approved includes $75,000 for research on the green bug, oak wilt, and the screw worm, and $50,000 for research on the wheat stem fly and Japanese beetle.

Amendment No. 20—*Insect and plant-disease control:* Appropriates $4,600,000, instead of $4,500,000 as proposed by the House and $4,716,062 as proposed by the Senate.

Control of Forest Pests

Amendment No. 21—*Forest Pest Control Act:* Reported in disagreement.

Forest Service

Amendment No. 22—*National forest protection and management:* Appropriates $27,322,025, instead of $27,122,025 as proposed by the House and $27,522,025 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23—*Forest research:* Appropriates $5,108,603 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $5,220,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 24—*Forest development roads and trails:* Appropriates $13,000,000, instead of $11,500,000 as proposed by the House and $14,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. In the opinion of the conferees expenditures for new timber access roads should be made from receipts from timber sales in such a manner that local contributions can be obtained from their timber receipts. It is hoped that legislation can be enacted during the coming year to make this possible.

Amendment No. 25—*Acquisition of lands, Weeks Act:* Appropriates $75,000, instead of $50,000 as proposed by the House and $100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26—*Acquisition of lands, Superior National Forest:* Appropriates $125,000, instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House and $150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 27, 28, and 29.—*Acquisition of lands, special acts:* Appropriate $141,680 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $142,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 30.—*Cooperative range improvements.*—Reported in disagreement.

Flood Control

Amendments Nos. 31 and 32.—Appropriate $6,372,800 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $6,112,800 as proposed by the House, and eliminate language inserted by the Senate to authorize funds for surveys of the watersheds of the Big Nemaha River, Little Nemaha River, and Weeping Water Creek in Nebraska. Even though this language is stricken, the conferees expect the Department to give this matter special attention in connection with special studies being made in the Missouri Basin area. It is expected that special attention will be given to projects where work is in progress but has heretofore been delayed.

Soil Conservation Service

Amendment No. 33.—*Salaries and expenses:* Strikes out a provision in the House bill limiting expenditures in the Everglades region in Florida.

Amendment No. 34—*Salaries and expenses:* Appropriates $53,474,991 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $54,278,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 35—*Water conservation and utilization projects:* Appropriates $235,500, instead of $185,500 as proposed by the House and $285,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Production and Marketing Administration

Amendments Nos. 36 and 37—*Conservation and use of agricultural land resources:* Appropriate $260,000,000, instead of $256,500,000 as proposed by the House and $280,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, and authorize a program for next year of $256,500,000, instead of $225,000,000 as proposed by the House and $280,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. These amounts have been agreed to by the conferees with the understanding that the program for the 1952 crop year will be reduced by the amount by which the appropriation for the fiscal year 1952 may be inadequate to meet commitments under the 1951 crop year program.

Amendment No. 38—*Conservation and use of agricultural land resources:* Substitutes perfecting language relative to authority for transfer of 5 percent of agriculture conservation funds to the Soil Conservation Service, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 39 and 40—*Agricultural production programs:* Appropriate $10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $8,300,000 as proposed by the House, of which $2,800,000 may be transferred for administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 41—*National school lunch program:* Appropriates $83,367,491 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $83,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 42—*Marketing services:* Reported in disagreement.

Commodity Exchange Authority

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates $650,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $591,072 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates $7,949,911 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $8,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Rural Electrification Administration

Amendments Nos. 45, 46, and 47—*Loan authorizations:* Reduce the contingency fund of $100,000,000 for rural electrification authorized by the House to $75,000,000, and provide a contingency fund of $25,000,000 for the rural telephone program as proposed by the Senate.

Farmers' Home Administration

Amendments Nos. 48 and 49—*Loan authorizations:* Authorize $110,000,000 for production and subsistence loans as proposed by the Senate, instead of $100,000,000 as proposed by the House, and $5,000,000 for water facilities loans as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,250,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 50—*Salaries and expenses:* Appropriates $27,825,000, instead of $27,500,000 as proposed by the House and $28,150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Farm Credit Administration

Amendments Nos. 51 and 52: Authorize $2,725,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,625,000 as proposed by the House, and appropriate $400,000 for research and technical assistance to farmers' cooperatives as proposed by the Senate, instead of $300,000 as proposed by the House.

Extension Service

Amendment No. 53—*Salaries and expenses:* Appropriates $850,000, instead of $880,000 as proposed by the House and $818,673 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 54: Appropriates $2,025,000, instead of $2,082,-200 as proposed by the House and $1,992,168 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations

Amendment No. 55: Appropriates $575,000, instead of $600,000 as proposed by the House and $548,054 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Information

Amendment No. 56: Appropriates $1,215,268 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,271,000 as proposed by the House.

Library

Amendment No. 57: Appropriates $641,237 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $700,000 as proposed by the House.

Research on Strategic and Critical Agricultural Materials

Amendment No. 58: Appropriates $550,000, instead of $450,000 as proposed by the House and $650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

International Wheat Agreement

Amendment No. 59: Appropriates $76,808,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are unanimously agreed that this item is more closely connected with our foreign policy than with activities of the Department of Agriculture and, accordingly, feel that is is not properly located in this appropriation bill.

Commodity Credit Corporation

Amendment No. 60: Reported in disagreement.

General Provisions

Amendment No. 61—*Section 401:* Authorizes the purchase of 350 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of 497 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 62: Eliminates, as proposed by the Senate, a provision carried in the House bill with reference to the payment of differentials to employees in the territories and possessions of the United States.

Amendments Nos. 63 and 64: Correct section numbers.

Amendments Nos. 65 and 66—*Section 409:* Restore language contained in the House bill with certain perfecting amendments and eliminate substitute language inserted by the Senate. The final provision agreed to, which is a revised version of the Jensen amendment, reduces personnel and personal services funds by 10 percent, with certain exceptions agreed upon by the conferees. All savings resulting from the operation of this provision shall be deposited into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. In making reductions required under this section, attention should be given to maintaining average grades and salaries throughout the Department at a reasonably constant level.

Amendment No. 67—*Section 410:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 68—*Section 411:* Inserts language proposed by the Senate prohibiting the payment of compensation to any civilian employee of the Government whose principal duties consist of acting as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle.

Amendment No. 69—*Section 412:* Inserts language proposed by the Senate to limit the payment of compensation to persons engaged in information activities to 75 percent of the 1952 budget estimates, as amended by the House.

Amendment No. 70: Corrects section number.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM G. STIGLER,
JOE B. BATES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

○

and study of the facts, evidence, and extenuating circumstances both before and after the massacre of thousands of Polish officers buried in a mass grave in the Katyn Forest on the banks of the Dnieper in the vicinity of Smolensk, which was then a Nazi occupied territory formerly having been occupied and under the control of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Upon completing the necessary hearings, the committee shall report to the House of Representatives (or the Clerk of the House, if the House is not in session) before the adjournment of the Eighty-second Congress the results of its investigation and its study, together with any recommendations which the committee shall deem advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

WILCOX ELECTRIC CO., INC.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1912) for the relief of the Wilcox Electric Co., Inc., with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 1, line 6, after "$104,121.52", insert ", less appropriate tax adjustments to the extent that the said company has benefited from this loss in computing its Federal excess profits tax and income tax liability for any year."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand from the chairman of the subcommittee that the only change in this bill made by the Senate is to make the amount in the bill subject to Federal taxes?

Mr. BYRNE of New York. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD of August 15 be corrected. On page A5382 in an extension by myself, third line from the bottom, the word "units" should be "rents."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 886)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 13, 32, 43 and 66.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 5, 9, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 23, 27, 28, 29, 31, 33, 34, 38, 39, 40, 41, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 56, 57, 59, 61, 62, 63, 64 and 70,

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$12,428,708"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,475,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,650,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$27,322,025"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$13,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$235,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$260,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$256,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$27,825,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$850,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,025,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$575,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$550,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 409. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within the department;

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to seasonal and casual workers;

"(e) to meat inspectors;

"(f) to field employees of the Soil Conservation Service and Production and Marketing Administration who provide conservation assistance to farmers and ranchers;

"(g) to field operating and research employees engaged in work of county offices and other field locations;

"(h) to employees of the crop and livestock reporting service:

Provided further, That with the exception of the agencies and functions listed in (a) to (h) above, not more than 90 per centum of the amounts shown in the budget estimates for personal services shall be available for such purpose: *Provided further*, That when the total number of personnel subject to this section has been reduced to 90 per centum of the total provided for in the budget estimates for 1952, this section may cease to apply: *Provided further*, That in addition to the funds otherwise allowed under this section, the following agencies shall be allowed additional sums for personnel as follows: Commodity Exchange Authority, $58,928; Extension Service, salaries and expenses, $31,327; Office of the Secretary, $32,832; Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, $26,946."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 411. Except for the car officially assigned to the Secretary of Agriculture, no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government whose principal duties consist of acting as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle (other than a bus or ambulance), unless such appropriation is specifically authorized to be used for paying the compensation of employees performing such duties."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 412. No part of the money appropriated for the Department of Agriculture by this Act or made available for expenditure by any corporation by this Act which is in excess of 75 per centum of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952 contemplated would be employed by the Department of Agriculture or by such corporation, respectively, during such fiscal year in the performance of—

"(1) functions performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title, or

"(2) functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions described in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating public information publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion pictures, and similar material,

shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing the functions described in (1) or (2): *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to personnel engaged in the preparation and distribution of technical agricultural publications and farmers bulletins, and the Agriculture Yearbook, the reporting and dissemination of the results of research and investigations, the preparation and broadcasting of the 'Farm and Home Hour' and similar radio programs, and other work required to carry out the duties and responsibilities of the Department imposed by law other than work intended primarily for press, radio and television services, and popular publications."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 21, 30, 42, 60 and 67.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM G. STIGLER,
JOE B. BATES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
PAT MCCARRAN,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
HOMER FERGUSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Research and Marketing Act

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $4,750,000, instead of $4,700,000 as proposed by the House and $4,850,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Amendment No. 2—Economic investigations: Appropriates $2,150,000, instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House and $2,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3—Crop and livestock estimates: Appropriates $2,848,304 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,850,000 as proposed by the House.

Office of Administrator, Agricultural Research Administration

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $541,440 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $560,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 5: Inserts language proposed by the Senate providing for the alteration of a building at Greenfield, Massachusetts, at a cost not to exceed $7,500.

Research on Agricultural Problems of Alaska

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $250,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $261,550 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Experiment Stations

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8—Payments to States, etc: Authorizes $50,000 for research in Alaska, instead of $37,500 as proposed by the House and $52,500 as proposed by the Senate, and appropriates a total of $12,428,708, instead of $12,416,208 as proposed by the House and $12,431,208 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $367,090 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $390,000 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Animal Industry

Amendment No. 10—Animal research: Appropriates $3,250,000, instead of $3,200,700 as proposed by the House and $3,320,700 as proposed by the Senate. The $49,300 authorized above the amount proposed by the House is to be used for research on infectious and noninfectious diseases.

Amendment No. 11—Animal disease control and eradication: Appropriates $7,731,022 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $7,750,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 12—Marketing agreements, hog cholera virus and serum: Appropriates $47,906 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $49,300 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 13—Meat inspection: Restores language proposed by the House which permits reimbursement for meat-inspection work required beyond that which can be met from appropriated funds.

Bureau of Dairy Industry

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $1,475,000, instead of $1,450,000 as proposed by the House and $1,491,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that the dairy work at Mandan, North Dakota, and Woodward, Oklahoma should be continued within the funds provided.

Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $7,250,000, instead of $7,200,000 as proposed by the House and $7,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering

Amendments Nos. 16 and 17—Plant, soil, and agricultural engineering research: Appropriate $10,589,730 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $10,351,400 as proposed by the House and authorize construction of a laboratory at Orlando, Florida. The additional funds provide $9,000 for onion research work and $40,000 for research on wheat mosaic. The $275,000 authorized for the laboratory at Orlando represents the full Federal contribution for the construction of this facility and not necessarily the full cost.

Amendment No. 18—National Arboretum: Appropriates $136,920 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $148,600 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine

Amendment No. 19—Insect investigations: Appropriates $3,650,000, instead of $3,525,000 as proposed by the House and $3,797,725 as proposed by the Senate. The increase approved includes $75,000 for research on the green bug, oak wilt, and the screw worm, and $50,000 for research on the wheat stem fly and Japanese beetle.

Amendment No. 20—Insect and plant-disease control: Appropriates $4,600,000, instead of $4,500,000 as proposed by the House and $4,716,062 as proposed by the Senate.

Control of forest pests

Amendment No. 21—Forest Pest Control Act: Reported in disagreement.

Forest service

Amendment No. 22—National forest protection and management: Appropriates $27,322,025, instead of $27,122,025, as proposed by the House and $27,522,025 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23—Forest research: Appropriates $5,108,603 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $5,220,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 24—Forest development roads and trails: Appropriates $13,000,000, instead of $11,500,000 as proposed by the House and $14,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. In the opinion of the conferees expenditures for new timber access roads should be made from receipts from timber sales in such a manner that local contributions can be obtained from their timber receipts. It is hoped that legislation can be enacted during the coming year to make this possible.

Amendment No. 25—Acquisition of lands, Weeks Act: Appropriates $75,000, instead of $50,000 as proposed by the House and $100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26—Acquisition of lands, Superior National Forest: Appropriates $125,000, instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House and $150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 27, 28, and 29—Acquisition of lands, Special Acts: Appropriate $141,680 as proposed by the Senate instead of $142,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 30—Cooperative Range Improvements: Reported in disagreement.

Flood control

Amendments Nos. 31 and 32—Appropriate $6,372,800 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $6,112,800 as proposed by the House, and eliminate language inserted by the Senate to authorize funds for surveys of the watersheds of the Big Nemaha River, Little Nemaha River, and Weeping Water Creek in Nebraska. Even though this language is stricken, the conferees expect the Department to give this matter special attention in connection with special studies being made in the Missouri Basin area. It is expected that special attention will be given to projects where work is in process but has heretofore been delayed.

Soil conservation service

Amendment No. 33—Salaries and expenses: Strikes out a provision in the House bill limiting expenditures in the Everglades Region in Florida.

Amendment No. 34—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $53,474,991 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $54,278,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 35—Water conservation and utilization projects: Appropriates $235,500, instead of $185,500 as proposed by the House and $285,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Production and marketing administration

Amendments Nos. 36 and 37—Conservation and use of agricultural land resources: Appropriates $260,000,000, instead of $256,500,000 as proposed by the House ad $280,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, and authorizes a program for next year of $256,500,000, instead of $225,000,000 as proposed by the House and $280,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. These amounts have been agreed to by the conferees with the understanding that the program for the 1952 crop year will be reduced by the amount by which the appropriation for the fiscal year 1952 may be inadequate to meet commitments under the 1951 crop year program.

Amendment No. 38—Conservation and use of agricultural land resources: Substitutes perfecting language relative to authority for transfer of 5 per cent of agriculture conservation funds to the Soil Conservation Service, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 39 and 40—Agricultural production programs: Appropriate $10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $8,300,000 as proposed by the House, of which $2,800,000 may be transferred for administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 41—National school lunch program: Appropriates $83,367,491 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $83,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 42—Marketing Services: Reported in disagreement.

Commodity Exchange Authority

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates $650,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $591,072 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates $7,949,911 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $8,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Rural Electrification Administration

Amendments Nos. 45, 46, and 47—Loan authorizations: Reduce the contingency fund of $100,000,000 for rural electrification authorized by the House to $75,000,000, and provide a contingency fund of $25,000,000 for the rural telephone program as proposed by the Senate.

Farmers Home Administration

Amendments Nos. 48 and 49—Loan authorizations: Authorize $110,000,000 for production and subsistence loans as proposed by the Senate, instead of $100,000,000 as proposed by the House, and $5,000,000 for water facilities loans as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,250,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 50—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $27,825,000, instead of $27,500,000 as proposed by the House and $28,150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Farm Credit Administration

Amendments Nos. 51 and 52: Authorize $2,725,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,625,000 as proposed by the House, and appropriate $400,000 for research and technical assistance to farmers' cooperatives as proposed by the Senate, instead of $300,000 as proposed by the House.

Extension service

Amendment No. 53—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $850,000, instead of $880,000 as proposed by the House and $818,673 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 54: Appropriates $2,025,000, instead of $2,082,200 as proposed by the House and $1,992,168 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations

Amendment No. 55: Appropriates $575,000, instead of $600,000 as proposed by the House and $548,054 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Information

Amendment No. 56: Appropriates $1,215,268 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,271,000 as proposed by the House.

Library

Amendment No. 57: Appropriates $641,237 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $700,000 as proposed by the House.

Research on strategic and critical agricultural materials

Amendment No. 58: Appropriates $550,000, instead of $450,000 as proposed by the House and $650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

International wheat agreement

Amendment No. 59: Appropriates $76,808,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are unanimously agreed that this item is more closely connected with our foreign policy than with activities of the Department of Agriculture and, accordingly, feel that it is not properly located in this appropriation bill.

Commodity Credit Corporation

Amendment No. 60: Reported in disagreement.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 61—Sec. 401: Authorizes the purchase of 350 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of 497 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 62: Eliminates, as proposed by the Senate, a provision carried in the House bill with reference to the payment of differentials to employees in the territories and possessions of the United States.

Amendments Nos. 63 and 64: Correct section numbers.

Amendments Nos. 65 and 66—Section 409: Restore language contained in the House bill with certain perfecting amendments and eliminate substitute language inserted by the Senate. The final provision agreed to, which is a revised version of the Jensen amendment reduce personnel and personal services funds by ten per cent, with certain exceptions agreed upon by the conferees. All savings resulting from the operation of this provision shall be deposited into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. In making reductions required under this section, attention should be given to maintaining average grades and salaries throughout the Department at a reasonably constant level.

Amendment No. 67—Section 410: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 68—Section 411: Inserts language proposed by the Senate prohibiting the payment of compensation to any civilian employee of the Government whose principal duties consist of acting as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle.

Amendment No. 69—Section 412: Inserts language proposed by the Senate to limit the payment of compensation to persons engaged in information activities to 75 percent of the 1952 budget estimates, as amended by the House.

Amendment No. 70: Corrects section number.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM G. STIGLER,
JOE B. BATES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VAIL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

AMERICAN PRESS

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, 1951, I introduced H. R. 2516, a bill to exclude from the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act any labor organization whose membership includes certain employees of newspapers and periodicals, which is affiliated with a national labor organization.

The measure was intended to provide a cause for liquidation of the existing relationship between the American Newspaper Guild and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, representing a most vicious alliance and one sharply opposed to sound public policy—shocking in its implications and constituting a threat of tremendous import in its potential effect upon our national security.

Undeniably the past score of years have wrought sweeping changes in our cherished American way of life, but no change we have witnessed is fraught with greater danger—no change represents a greater potential for evil—than the bold and thus far partially success-

ful effort of the CIO radicals to control the press of the country through its affiliate, the American Newspaper Guild, CIO.

Even the most unenlightened can readily grasp the significance of control of the press by domination under union rules of its reportorial and editorial staffs by an organization such as the CIO, which departs as far from American principles of equity and justice in its program for industrial and political demoralization as would a raiding group from Mars or Moscow.

The recognized power of the press imposes an obligation upon every American to analyze, appraise, and cooperate to defeat any attempt to control and direct news content by vicious interests. It imposes upon the Congress an obligation to closely observe and to curb, through legislation, activities endangering the freedom of the press or the interest of the American public in honest news presentation. That obligation, the legislation I propose seeks to discharge. Through ANG-CIO affiliation and its implied fusion of interests and sympathies, substantiated by the record, self-seeking, irresponsible newsmen, disdainful of national welfare, contemptuous of the fundamental obligation of their profession to avoid influencing entanglements, subordinating traditional ethics to doubtful personal gains, have delivered themselves and their talents and have provided a tremendously powerful weapon to the Socialist-Communist infiltrated CIO, whose warped ideals and goon tactics have been well evidenced over the years since the organization was founded under the sponsorship of the New Deal administration.

The relationship between the ANG and the CIO has been slyly and effectively maneuvered over the 15 years of its existence and meager information concerning the encroachment of the vicious combination upon the newspaper field has appeared in the press for reasons that may be easily understood since an aroused public would demand speedy dissolution. I venture to say that few Americans are aware that the news items, the editorials, or the columns they read in their favorite newspaper may have been written by members of the CIO or that the content of what they read may have been directed by CIO master minds in the upper echelon of the national organization, who are keenly cognizant of the value of favorable publicity and who hold an economic whip hand over its guild affiliates, since cancellation of membership for disobedience would deprive guildsmen of employment on the 60 percent of American newspapers that are now claimed to be operating under CIO guild contracts.

To sound Americans, the voluntary action of a trusted and important element of society in providing so effective a club to insure submission to CIO domination of the American press is beyond comprehension. It is almost unbelievable that so brazen a conspiracy to direct public opinion and control vehicles of public information could be conceived in the minds of so vital a segment of our American citizenry until the identity of the characters initiating the movement is revealed, providing the key to understanding. Leadership of the guild, founded in 1933, was originally undertaken by the radical columnist, Heywood Broun, according to sworn testimony, in 1933, a member of the Communist Party—volume 7, page 4713; volume 9, page 5461, Committee on Un-American Activities Hearings—and later a member of the executive board of the CIO, and associated with him in his organizational activities were Morris Ernst; Ben Gitlow, former secretary general of the Communist Party; Joseph Zack, former national trade-union secretary of the Communist Party; Morris Malkin; Morris Watson; Jack Stachel; Jonathan Eddy, and Carl Randau, all Communists or followers of the party line. By what stretch of the imagination can it be conveived that this gentry bent effort to a program dedicated purely and solely to the interest of the newspaper profession? Yet, notwithstanding such highly questionable sponsorship, weak-kneed renegades from the traditional ethics and objectivity of the fourth estate lost no time in boarding the Red bandwagon.

According to their own statement, the ANG-CIO now comprises 25,000 newspaper men and women, with locals in 100 cities of the United States, reporting and editing for 177 daily and Sunday newspapers and 45 news magazines and other publications and embracing radio commentators, as well, and the same statement proclaims as one of its major objectives, "to carry on the struggle for free trade-unionism as the most effective weapon for democracy throughout the world." It should be carefully noted that the interests of this so-called American newsmen's labor organization, presumably established to promote the welfare of its own specific American craft, clearly are not confined to the boundaries of the United States but are worldwide in scope, and it is also a significant fact that they have consistently refused to oust known Communists from membership. This unsavory alliance of newswriters operating a Political Action Committee of their own with a national labor organization, also operating a Political Action Committee, which chose as its chief counsel, Lee Pressman, an admitted Communist, and which is itself an explosive container of Socialist and Communist doctrines, is a self-evident menace not only to freedom of the press but to national security that cannot be ignored. Undeniably the association connotes a community of thought and action that is decidedly opposed to sound public policy, since press and radio are the prime agencies for molding public opinion and I submit that the principle involved in the relationship, its current and past conspiratorial activity and its potentialities, represents a fruitful field for congressional investigation.

Section 17 of article VII, local guilds, in the Manual of the American Newspaper Guild, reads as follows:

Locals shall do all in their power to strengthen the labor movement in their respective areas.

Can we be so naive that we cannot interpret that article to mean that guild members are policy-bound to extend favorable press consideration to CIO interests and that CIO interests and that CIO-recommmended political candidates, committed to CIO aims, would be accorded press support or tempered treatment?

If proof is needed, reference is made to the resolution adopted at the guild annual convention in 1944 calling for all-out cooperation with the CIO Political Action Committee. That resolution still represents ANG policy in the absence of subsequent withdrawal.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAIL. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I noticed that the gentleman mentions the name of Joseph Zack. I happen to know him. I know his background. The gentleman has stated that correctly. But he has done everything within his power to assist us and assist our Government to turn the spotlight on and expose communism.

Mr. VAIL. I am happy to know that.

Mr. DONDERO. I know he has been before the Committee on Un-American Activities and has rendered fine service to our country.

Mr. VAIL. I am happy to know that. I thank the gentleman.

In this presentation I shall trace sketchily the connection from the inception of the CIO Political Action Committee to the present, citing facts that will establish beyond question the appalling potential, in opposition to the public interest, of the close working agreement between the ANG and the CIO and their respective Political Action Committees.

Quoting from the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities, House Report No. 1311:

The origin of the idea of the CIO Political Action Committee is of real importance. That origin was definitely with the Communist Party and some of its leaders. Communist Party publications, such as the New Masses and the Daily Worker, bore down heavily upon the need for an organization like the CIO Political Action Committee in the weeks preceding the formation of Hillman's committee. The record shows beyond possibility of any dispute that well-known Communists immediately assumed important roles in the regional, State and local activities of the CIO Political Action Committee.

Having already captured the leading positions in so many of the CIO industrial councils, the Communists have a ready made machinery for carrying out their political objectives. What was hitherto simply the local branch of the Communist Party now becomes, with the transformation of the party into an educational association, the local CIO Political Action Committee. In other words, the "comrades" preside one night over the CIO Industrial Union Council and the next night the same "comrades" preside over the CIO Political Action Committee.

One of the methods by which the CIO Political Action Committee is at present carrying out its attack upon the Congress of the United States is the use of a chart which shows how the Members of the House of Representatives have voted on 20 measures. Members of Congress expect to be judged on their voting records but the im-

1951 (Public Law 911, 81st Cong.), under the heading "Department of the Interior, Southeastern Power Administration, Construction", is hereby rescinded and shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this act."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"The unobligated portion of the $1,850,000 appropriation contained in chapter V of the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 911, 81st Cong.), under the heading 'Department of the Interior, Southeastern Power Administration, Construction', is hereby rescinded and shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this act."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: Page 3, line 25, after "area", insert ": *Provided*, That the following paragraph under the heading 'Office of the Secretary, Continuing Fund, Power Transmission Facilities', in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950 (Public Law 350, 81st Cong.), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'CONTINUING FUND

"'Continuing Fund, Power Transmission Facilities: All receipts from the transmission and sale of electric power and energy under the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), generated or purchased in the southwestern power area, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, except that the Treasury shall set up and maintain from such receipts a continuing fund of $300,000, including the sum of $100,000 in the continuing fund established under the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944 (57 Stat. 621), which shall be transferred to the fund hereby established: and said fund of $300,000 shall be placed to the credit of the Secretary and shall be subject to check by him to defray emergency expenses necessary to insure continuity of electric service and continuous operation of the facilities'."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ": *Provided*, That the paragraph under the heading "Office of the Secretary, Continuing Fund, Power Transmission Facilities," in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950 (Public Law 350, 81st Cong.), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof, before the final period ': *Provided*, That expenditures from this fund to cover such costs in connection with the purchase of electric power and energy and rentals for the use of facilities are to be made only in such amounts as may be approved annually in appropriation acts and for the fiscal year 1952 such expenditures may be made not in excess of $250,000'."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 10½: Page 5, line 9, after "granted", insert ": *Provided*, That $250,000 of the amount appropriated herein shall be available for purchase of electric power and energy and for leasing of transmission lines and related facilities of others."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 14: Page 6, line 1, insert:

"TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FACILITIES, DENISON DAM PROJECT

"The jurisdiction and control of the Denison-Payne 132-kilovolt transmission line is hereby vested in the Secretary of the Interior, and the interdepartmental accounts shall be adjusted accordingly."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: At the end of the last line thereof, before the final period, insert "without transfer of funds."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 24: Page 9, line 1, insert:

"CONSTRUCTION

"For construction of access roads on the revested Oregon & California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands; acquisition of rights-of-way and of existing connecting roads adjacent to such lands; to remain available until expended, $995,000, of which not to exceed $45,000 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That the amount appropriated herein for road construction shall be transferred to the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$995,000" named in said amendment insert "$700,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 40: On page 14, line 8, after "reservations", insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for construction or repair of the Tongue River Indian Reservation electric line, Montana, but the Secretary is hereby authorized to enter into a reimbursable contract with the Tongue River Electric Cooperative, Inc., Montana, with respect to maintenance, operation, and subsequent transfer of ownership of said line."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: At the end of the last line thereof insert "and the Bureau of Indian Affairs may accept payment for such line in the form of credit on electric bills."

(Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. D'EWART addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 57: Page 19, line 16, after "facilities", insert the following: "and including a payment to the Grand Coulee School District, Washington, for school facilities, proportionate to the payment made to the Coulee Dam District, Washington, in fiscal 1951, based on relative enrollment of dependents of Bureau of Reclamation and contractor employees."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "and including a final payment of not to exceed $282,275 to the Grand Coulee School District, Washington, to be made for school facilities, in accordance with the agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Grand Coulee School District, based on enrollment of dependents of Bureau of Reclamation and contractor employees, such payment to constitute full and final discharge of all Federal responsibility arising out of enrollment of dependents of employees of the Bureau of Reclamation and its contractors."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 83: Page 27, line 14, after "United States", insert the following: "shall be repayable by said district to the United States unless said district shall be judicially determined to be not liable therefor."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "shall be repayable by said district to the United States unless said district shall be judicially determined by a court of competent jurisdiction to be not liable therefor."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 124: On page 45, line 6, insert the following:

"SEC. 109. Transfers to the Department of the Interior pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 of property, other than real, excess to the needs of Federal agencies may be made at the request of the Secretary without reimbursement or transfer of funds when required by the Department for operations conducted in the Territories and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 124, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 109. Transfers to the Department of the Interior pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 of property, other than real, excess to the needs of the Navy Department may be made during the current fiscal year at the request of the Secretary of the Interior without reimbursement or transfer of funds when required by the Interior Department for operations conducted in the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and American Samoa."

[Mr. TACKETT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at that point where amendment No. 4 was under discussion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present. Some of us want to be heard on this and we have not been treated fairly.

Mr. NORRELL. Why, I would be glad to yield time to the gentleman. May I say, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has not made any request of me for time at all.

Mr. RANKIN. I certainly have been standing here all the time seeking recognition.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

(Mr. ARMSTRONG and Mr. TACKETT asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks.)

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of August 16, 1951.)

Mr. WHITTEN (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the conferees have agreed with the Senate on all matters with one exception which is brought back here in actual disagreement.

The House bill carried approximately $717,000,000. The Senate had to add to that in view of the fact of the International Wheat Agreement coming up, but on a comparative figure the Senate figures amounted to approximately $750,000,000. The conference report agrees to approximately $725,000,000 which, on a comparative basis, as I have stated, is about $8,000,000 more than the bill which passed the House and about $25,000,000 less than that as it passed the Senate to which, of course, must be added the funds for the International Wheat Agreement.

I call attention to the fact that as the bill passed the House it was less than 50 percent of what the appropriation was for 1940. Your conference committee and the Committee on Appropriations have consistently reduced these appropriations.

We have reached some compromise with regard to the PMA program. In this report we have authorized a program for next year of $256,500,000 which is about $23,500,000 below the Senate figure, although somewhat higher than the House figure. We provide in appropriations $260,000,000 which is $20,000,000 below the Senate figures.

We have tried to provide for range improvements by language which in effect is to pay for such from receipts

We have seen to it that with certain listed exceptions, 10 percent of all the money set out in the bill for personnel is no longer available. We have retained the features of the Jensen amendment as it was originally written, with the further provision, which, in my judgment, makes it workable. That is, within the 90 percent that is available they can shift personnel around within the department so as to actually meet its need within the personnel available.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this occasion to inform the House that the gentleman from Mississippi has been very helpful in working out a good compromise on the Jensen-Ferguson proposition.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi a question for the purpose of the RECORD. I refer to that part of the report having to do with the Parma, Idaho, onion research item, which is a very small item, but I notice that the words "Parma, Utah," are not in the report. It is my understanding that it is the intention of the conferees that that particular item of $9,000 be expended at that particular station; is that correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is correct. We thought that making an especial allowance to special locations is not good practice, but since this work is centered there it is intended to be spent there. It was thoroughly understood that is where the money would be expended.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. One further comment. I was very much pleased that the conferees agreed to my suggestion that we recede to the Senate position on amendments numbered 51 and 52, which affect largely research and technical assistance given to farmers' cooperatives. As the House will recall at the time the bill was up on the floor for consideration, I stated that in my opinion, we on the House side made an unwise cut in that particular item; in fact, we sliced it by about 40 percent. This restoration of $100,000 by the Senate, to which the House conferees agreed at my urging, will enable the worthwhile projects in cooperative research to be carried out.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Will the gentleman tell us what the conference agreed on with respect to amendment No. 30?

Mr. WHITTEN. In effect what we tried to do was to say that the money is available for this purpose, but it amounts to making it available from receipts in that enough of the receipts that would otherwise be due to the counties and States would be retained to pay their fourth. So it amounts to carrying on the policy which the Department has done in the past without authority. Now, that was my own position in that matter and we have tried to work it out where the Department can carry on the work with the local areas meeting one-fourth of the cost from receipts due such area.

Mr. GRANGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified to note that the committee of conference on this bill has accepted the items inserted by the Senate Committee on Appropriations dealing with research on diseases and insect pests affecting wheat. I am referring particularly to

the item of $40,000 to the Bureau of Plant Industry for research on wheat mosaic disease and $40,000 to the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine for research on greenbugs.

These research items are of great interest and importance to wheat growers everywhere and particularly those in the hard winter wheat section of the Southwest where disease and insect damage have materially contributed to sharp reductions in wheat production both in 1950 and 1951. It is not contended that all of this loss was directly due to greenbugs and wheat mosaic, but these were important contributing factors, and it is imperative that a program of research dealing with these subjects be begun and carried out for such period as may be necessary.

I desire to call to the attention of the House the following figures which show the great decline in wheat production which has taken place in the Southwest hard winter wheat area:

	1945–49 5-year average production	1950 production	1951 August estimate
	Bushels	*Bushels*	*Bushels*
Kansas	220, 600, 000	178, 000, 000	126, 732, 000
Nebraska	80, 000, 000	84, 128, 000	58, 965, 000
Oklahoma	90, 800, 000	43, 614, 000	40, 394, 000
Texas	79, 400, 000	22, 712, 000	17, 325, 000
Colorado	48, 800, 000	38, 199, 000	30, 213, 000
New Mexico	4, 600, 000	645, 000	781, 000
Total	524, 200, 000	367, 358, 000	274, 410, 000

Wheat producers do not expect the Federal Government to carry the entire burden of research on these matters. The State of Kansas has greatly expanded its research program on wheat and cereal diseases and pests. Other States in the area have done likewise. Private commercial organizations such as railroads and farm machinery companies which have a direct interest in the volume of wheat production are expected to make important contributions for research. The National Association of Wheat Growers and the various State organizations of wheat growers are taking an active part in securing adequate funds for research, as is the Kansas Wheat Improvement Association. Farm organizations in the States affected, such as the Farm Bureau, the National Grange, and the Farmers Union are interested, and commercial and industrial organizations such as the Western Kansas Development Association and local chambers of commerce are doing much in developing interest in research. However no matter how much may be undertaken at the State and local levels, it is important and necessary that the vast resources of the Department of Agriculture and the Agricultural Research Administration be enlisted in this research program, not only because of the work which will be done by the able scientists in the Agricultural Research Administration, but in order to make this a truly national research program.

It is important also to emphasize that a program of this kind must be a continuing one and that research takes time and patience. We cannot expect immediate and early results from any research program.

I am sure that the wheat producers of this country join me in thanking Senator RUSSELL, the distinguished chairman, of the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and the other members of the subcommittee for inserting these items in the bill, and the able chairman of the House committee, JAMIE WHITTEN, and the other conferees from the House for accepting these items in conference.

At this point, pursuant to permission given me by the House, I desire to submit some extracts from the statement which I made on this subject before the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations on July 13, 1951:

Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the opportunity which you have given me to appear before the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations for the purpose of urging consideration of an increase in appropriations dealing with research on diseases and insect pests affecting wheat. I am appearing at this time because the 1951 wheat crop has suffered heavy damage from insect pests, particularly greenbugs, cutworms, and brown mites, and from the mosaic disease. The territory affected this year embraces the entire Southwest wheat-growing area comprising six States, and I understand that there have been losses in other States. This matter was not presented to the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations for the reason that at the time its hearings were held, the great damage to this year's crop had not become apparent.

On May 9, after it had become clear that tremendous injury had been done to this year's crop, this committee heard a group representing agricultural colleges, organizations of wheat producers, and others on the subject of increased appropriations for research on the problems of wheat diseases and insect infestation including not only the matters which I have mentioned but research in connection with new races of rust, particularly 15B, which have attacked strains of wheat hitherto resistant to other types of rust. I wish to endorse the research program which was presented to the subcommittee at that time.

It is impossible to say at this time the aggregate losses which have been suffered by the 1951 wheat crop due to insect pests and mosaic disease. This is due in part to the fact that in some cases these have not been direct causes of all of the losses but have been contributory causes. For instance, much wheat in western Kansas was winter-killed, but undoubtedly the fact that the plant was weakened by disease and insect infestation materially contributed to the winter kill. I do want to call attention to the fact that the wheat crop in the States directly affected by these pests and disease is materially below the 10-year average.

The wheat crop of this country has had an annual value of more than $2,000,000,000. It is grown on a large percentage of the farms in this country. Other industries such as milling and transportation are closely tied in with it. If any crop can be called basic, it is wheat.

The amount which has been spent in this country on wheat research by the Federal Government has been and is very small. I believe the time has come when we must provide additional funds for this purpose. It is not necessary that all of such additional funds be provided by the Federal Government. The State of Kansas has increased its appropriations for this purpose. I understand other States have done likewise. Some funds are available from private sources. I do not want to urge that any funds be appropriated to the Department of Agriculture for research on these matters in excess of what the scientists in the Department of Agriculture say can be used effectively. I have discussed this question with those in the Department who are most familiar with this problem both in the Bureau of Plant Industry and in the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine. In response to my inquiries they advise that the most important thing to be considered in a program of this kind is continued and sustained research over a period of years. They state in response to my inquiries that if they had available in the Bureau of Plant Industry from $30,000 to $50,000 per year for the next 10 years, it would be possible by working with the States and private agencies to carry out a program of research in the pathology and economic phases of mosaic disease of which very little is known at the present time; and that if $50,000 per year were made available to the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine a very good research program on brown mite, cutworms, and greenbugs could be carried out in connection with the States and interested private agencies.

I believe if these funds are made available over such period of time as may be necessary, they will be returned a thousandfold in the prevention of future disastrous losses due to these infestations. That has been our experience in all types of agricultural research. I know of no funds expended by the Federal Government which have brought in greater returns in added wealth and in the well-being of our people.

I have not included in my figures an amount to cover research in connection with the new rust, 15B. This matter has been adequately presented, however, and I wish to urge the appropriation of whatever amounts can be used by the Bureau of Plant Industry in meeting that situation and in continued research on the problem of developing rust-resistant varieties of wheat and eliminating sources of rust.

In view of the fact that there may be contained in this appropriation bill provisions which limit the amount of funds available for personal services, I would like to suggest that the following language be incorporated in the measure so as to make certain that the amounts appropriated may all be used for this necessary and emergency situation. This language is as follows: "Including not to exceed ——— dollars for additional research on wheat disease which is not subject to limitations in this act relating to the amounts available for personal service," and with similar provisions relating to the additional appropriation for insect pests.

Let me again say that I sincerely appreciate this opportunity of presenting this serious situation to the subcommittee.

(Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

SOCIAL SECURITY FOR OUR ELDERLY CITIZENS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions I have called the attention of my colleagues to Discharge Petition 4 on the Speaker's desk which has for its purpose to discharge the committee from further consideration of H. R. 2678 which will bring up for consideration on the floor this bill, as well as the companion bill, H. R. 2679, introduced by my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

It is of vital importance to the welfare of the elderly people of America

that this legislation be considered and passed at an early date. There are hundreds of thousands of old folks who are in dire need. Many of them are wasting away from malnutrition. We have recently passed appropriation bills which before we are through will approach $100,000,000,000 but nothing for the old folks of America. The bill we are now considering calls for the expenditure of almost $8,000,000,000 for foreign aid.

I asked the Federal Security Agency to supply me with statistics showing the number of persons in the United States 60 years of age and over and information as to their sources of income, if any, and the amount thereof. This information is most enlightening and should have the careful consideration of every Member of Congress. I will include the correspondence in these remarks but I call attention especially to the following information. It is estimated that the number of persons 65 years of age and over receiving income from social insurance and related programs and from old-age assistance is in the neighborhood of five and one-half to six million, and that 12,300,000 persons 65 years and over were enumerated in the census in April 1950.

Of the 6,000,000 in the labor force only 4,000,000 are in covered employment. There are about 1,500,000 employed persons not covered by any retirement system. There are about five to six million persons in this age group who are not in the labor force; neither are they married to persons in the labor force, nor in receipt of payments directly or indirectly under social security or old-age assistance or related programs.

The 2,760,000 recipients of old-age assistance as of February 1951 received an average monthly payment of $43.11, carrying from $18.39 in Mississippi to $67.52 in California. Under the old-age and survivors insurance program as of February 1951 the average payment was $43.32. These are starvation allowances.

I include the full report which is as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANGELL: I submit below replies to the questions asked in your letter of June 21.

1. The number of persons in the United States 60 years of age or over.

Preliminary returns from the 1950 census indicate that there were 18,272,000 persons in the United States in April 1950 aged 60 years and over.

2. The number of persons over 60 years of age who are wholly or partially dependent on aid from relatives, pensions or other relief.

In December 1950, the latest month for which we have developed estimates of this character, approximately 2,600,000 persons 65 years of age and over were receiving benefits under the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance program, 300,000 under the railroad retirement program, 100,000 under the Federal civil-service-retirement program and about 200,000 under the retirement programs for employees of State and local governments. Persons 65 years and over receiving pensions or compensation as aged or disabled veterans, or as the survivors of deceased veterans numbered about one-quarter of a million. Close to 200,000 women 65 years of age and over were married to men receiving benefits under the programs just enumerated, other than old-age and survivors' insurance. Persons in receipt of old-age assistance under the Federal-State program for aid to the needy aged numbered 2,800,000. Some persons received income from more than one of the sources mentioned, but we have no information on the extent of such overlapping. When a rough adjustment is made for this factor, the unduplicated number of persons 65 years of age and over with income from social insurance and related programs and from old-age assistance is in the neighborhood of 5,500,000 to 6,000,000, or somewhat less than half the 12,300,000 persons 65 years and over enumerated in the census in April 1950.

We do not have similar information for the age group 60 to 64 years.

We do not know how many persons are wholly or partially dependent on aid from relatives.

3. The number of persons in the United States 60 years of age or over who are not covered by any pension annuity program, private or public.

4. The number of persons 60 years of age or over who are now covered under the social security program.

We will answer these questions together, since they involve the same set of estimates.

Of the 18,000,000 persons aged 60 years and over, approximately 6,000,000 are in the labor force in an average week. The other 12,000,000 have retired from the labor force because of age or disability or consist of women who left gainful employment some time ago because of marriage, or who had never been in the labor force. Of the 6,000,000 in the labor force, perhaps 4,000,000 are in employments covered by the old-age and survivors insurance program, while another three-tenths to five-tenths million are in employments covered under other public retirement programs, such as the railroad program and the programs for Federal, State, and local government employees. About 1,500,000, perhaps, are in employments not covered by any public retirement system, primarily self-employment in agriculture, and in certain professions. Among the 12,000,000 persons 60 years of age and over not in the labor force in an average week, close to 2,000,000 are the wives of men in the labor force. Most of the 2,600,000 persons in receipt of benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance program are to be found in this group of 12,000,000 not in the labor force, as well as most of the 1,000,000 individuals either receiving benefits under the railroad, and Government retirement programs and the veterans programs or married to men in receipt of such benefits. The 12,000,000 not in the labor force also include about 2,800,000 persons on old-age assistance. Perhaps five to six million persons are neither in the labor force, nor married to men in the labor force, or in receipt of payments directly or indirectly under social insurance and related programs or under the old-age assistance program.

5. The average payments that are now being made to persons under old-age and survivors insurance.

Monthly payments to the individuals, by benefit type, averaged as follows in February 1951:

Old-age	$43.32
Wife's or husband's	23.34
Child's	27.46
Widow's or widower's	36.47
Mother's	34.05
Parent's	36.65

6. The number of persons now receiving payments under old-age relief provisions of the social security program and the average monthly payment to each at the present time.

Recipients of old-age assistance numbered 2,760,000 in February 1951. The average monthly payment under this program was $43.11. The average payment among the States varied from $18.39 in Mississippi to $67.52 in California.

If you wish any further information along these lines please do not hesitate to write again.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN L. THURSTON,
Acting Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, it has frequently been called to the attention of the Congress that the funds received under old-age and survivors insurance by the Social Security Administration are expended by the Government for general expenses of the Government as received and that the fund, aside from cash on hand, is made up entirely of United States I O U's. Up to June 30, 1951, employers and employees had contributed to this trust fund $18,252,000,000 and only $4,874,000,000 has been disbursed as benefit payments. The administrative expenses were $459,000,000. The total I O U's in the trust fund as of June 30, 1951, amounted to $14,323,000,000, with a total cash on hand of $413,000,000, making the total assets $14,736,000,000.

I include a letter to me from A. J. Altmeyer, Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, dated August 16, 1951, giving the complete information on the trust fund, which is as follows:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
Washington, August 16, 1951.

Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANGELL: This is in reply to your letter of August 1, requesting certain data on the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

There have been transfers totaling $12,000,000 from the general fund to the trust fund under the provisions of section 210 of the Social Security Act in effect prior to enactment of the 1950 amendments. These provisions, which provided insurance benefits to survivors of certain veterans of World War II, authorized reimbursement to the trust fund for sums withdrawn to meet the additional cost (including administrative expenses) of these payments.

The following tabulation summarizes the financial operations of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund for the period January 1, 1937, to June 30, 1951:

		Jan. 1, 1937, to June 30, 1951 [In millions]
Employers' and employees' contributions to trust fund	$18,252	
Interest on investments	1,805	
Transfers from general fund	12	
Total trust fund receipts		$20,069
Less:		
Benefit payments	$4,874	
Administrative expenses	459	5,333
Total assets		14,736
Total investments	$14,323	
Total cash on hand	413	14,736

All of the assets at June 30, 1951, except for $413,000,000 held in cash for current

disbursements were invested in interest-bearing United States Government securities.

If I can be of further assistance to you, please don't hesitate to write to me again.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. ALTMEYER,
Commissioner.

Mr. Speaker, this information brings to our attention most vividly the necessity of enacting a Federal old-age-security program such as is embodied in my bill, H. R. 2678, commonly known as the Townsend plan. The present plan has proved to be wholly insufficient to give protection to millions of elderly people and should be overhauled or an entirely new program enacted. I trust that every Member of the House interested in old-age security will sign Discharge Petition No. 4 and bring this legislation on the floor for consideration.

(Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention, if I may, to a rather peculiar situation. In this bill, which the President has not yet signed, we have made certain reductions. Take the Bureau of Economics, for example. We have made certain reductions and here before us is final concurrence in that action. The President has not as yet signed this bill, yet further money has already been requested. The supplemental bill reported today by the full Appropriations Committee is giving back to B. and Q. E. practically the same amount I succeeded in deducting during the House consideration. The same thing applies to the Secretary's immediate office. In the supplemental bill, which will come up in a few days, there is restored to the Secretary's office $50,000, right after the Congress has agreed in the regular bill to practically the same amount as a reduction. It seems to me on the one hand we are trying to make a saving and on the other hand we have supplemental bills coming in amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars, largely undoing the work that we have been trying all this spring to accomplish as far as economy is concerned. Other members of the Committee on Appropriations are going to have something to say on this supplemental bill when it comes before the House next Monday.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the point the gentleman raises is not involved in this conference report.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is correct. I am simply informing the House that this matter will be discussed thoroughly next Monday. There is no sense in our making reductions in one bill, only to have that action repudiated almost immediately by a bill reported by another subcommittee.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 21: Page 18, line 8, strike out "$1,700,000" and insert "$3,600,000."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ASPINALL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to amendment of the Senate numbered 21 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: Strike the figure "$3,600,000" as it appears in said Senate amendment, and in lieu thereof insert the figure "$2,700,000."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, upon two previous occasions my colleagues from Colorado and I have brought before this forum a situation which exists in Colorado relative to the spruce bark beetle infestation. The gentleman from Mississippi, chairman of this subcommittee, has been very gracious in cooperating with us so that we would have an opportunity to present the condition out there. However, he remains adamant in his position, and I can understand his position thoroughly. On the other hand, I do not like to see the forests of Colorado being made the goat for certain procedures that perhaps have taken place within the Department of Agriculture in the presentation of requests before the Subcommittee on Appropriations; neither do I like to see our part of the Nation and this property that is owned by the Nation being made the goat for certain promises that have been made and allegedly have not been kept by the Department of Agriculture in its expenditure of funds.

When this matter was brought before the House previously we tried to get an appropriation for over $3,000,000 in order to continue our fight against the spruce bark beetle infestation. However, we did not at any time, in discussing the supplemental bill or the regular bill, ask for a vote and a decision. When the bill went to the Senate, the Senate appropriated $1,900,000, realizing that the lateness of the season would make an impossible situation as far as spending the whole amount requested of the House committee. Now as the report of the conference committee is brought to the House there is no provision for any appropriation for the purpose of combating the beetle infestation. My amendment would decrease the amount allowed by the Senate by $900,000 and would give an appropriation for $1,000,000 to carry out approximately 5 weeks' work this summer in this eradication program. Since I talked to you and since my colleagues addressed you on this matter there has been a very effective campaign by the Denver Post, one of the great newspapers of the United States, and each one of you has received at different times a personal letter from the editor as well as some physical tokens of what is taking place in the spruce forests of Colorado.

Also, since that time great conservation groups have entered into the picture. The Isaac Walton League of the United States especially have stated their support of a program which would help carry on this eradication project.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Is it not true that this is not only a problem for the State of Colorado, but this beetle infestation might spread to all the forests of the country?

Mr. ASPINALL. I am glad the gentleman from Utah has brought that to my attention. The States of Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico are either infested at the present time or in danger of immediate infestation. But there is no reason that other spruce forests throughout the Nation may become affected if the infestation in Colorado is not controlled.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POULSON. Is it not true that this will affect the entire United States, because we all use this lumber? Further, it is false economy to cut such items as these from the budget.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank the gentleman from California. He is absolutely right.

May I suggest to you that Colorado and other Western States have in the properties within their borders five great natural resources which are of benefit to the country: Forests, grazing lands, mining resources, national parks and monuments, and watersheds. In this particular problem you have four of these natural resources classifications involved which affect the entire United States. You have the forests and the value of the timber. You have been advised as to the value of the timber. You have the grazing lands most certainly. In our area where it is dry and hot you do not have good grazing even in the mountain areas unless you have a certain amount of forests. Then we have the national parks and the monuments, and we have the watersheds.

We appropriate millions of dollars to take care of dams and reservoirs lower down the Colorado River, but if the forests of Colorado, the State which furnishes 71 percent of the water of the Colorado River, are denuded and the spring run-off is allowed to carry the silt and debris down into these reservoirs, they are filled with sediment and their primary usefulness is curtailed and endangered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. I join my colleague from western Colorado on this matter simply because I am sure if we all understood exactly what the funds for which the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] is asking mean to the United States of America, not Colorado alone, there

would not be a single vote against this appropriation.

As I understand, we have 2,000,000 acres of land already infested or in the path of this destructive beetle pest. If you destroy 2,000,000 acres of timberland high up on the mountains, you do more than destroy the resources up on the mountains, you prepare the way for floods down in the valley. You prepare the way for cities to be short of water in the valleys below those great watersheds.

There are three rivers affected, three river sheds, the Colorado River, the Rio Grande, ad the Platte River.

Certainly we cannot afford as Members of this House to fail to recognize this terrific danger that is represented by the destruction of our forests. It is only a small matter to this House today if you will give us a million dollars to continue this work. I checked up here a moment ago and found that it would be one-seventh of 1 percent of the amount in this bill. I certainly feel that we cannot afford not to go on record here this morning as supplying funds to take care of our forests.

What is more important than to protect this natural resource, the forests that belong to you? Do not forget that 90 percent of all the forests that you and I are legislating for here today that belong to the United States Government are in those 11 Western States. We should protect them. I hope the motion of the gentleman from Colorado prevails.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I concur exactly. I am in support of the gentleman's amendment. His statement has been a splendid one. If anything, it was an understatement.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank the gentleman.

I am informed that we send money to the Far East to fight the locusts, and I have voted for such appropriations, I suppose. I think that while taking care of the locusts in foreign countries we should also take care of some of the domestic pests at home.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. I join with the gentleman in supporting this amendment. Certainly, it is in the interest of the country as a whole to preserve this watershed and the timber that is on it. I think the amendment should be adopted, and I am glad to support it.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. I am in sympathy with the gentleman's amendment. I hope this is enough money to do the job, and, if not, the gentleman should offer an amendment to provide enough money to do it.

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, so that there will be no misunderstanding on this item, and so that any criticism which may seem to fall upon the shoulders of the committee may be dispelled, I would like to say that this item has not for the last 2 years been justified very well before our committee. We have found that we have been given all sorts of misleading statements. I want to say for my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi, that his position is justified upon the basis of the conflicting testimony given to us on the subcommittee by the Forest Service.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I understand that the reason for eliminating this is because the committee takes the position that the Forest Service has not made a proper report to you?

Mr. HORAN. That is correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Is that any reason why you should not at this time continue to try to eradicate the beetles from the forests?

Mr. HORAN. Definitely—I am speaking in favor of the amendment. I hope the gentleman understands that.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. Is there any other basis on which to make appropriations except on the basis of justifications? You just cannot throw the Government's money to the winds. The justifications are supposed to be the basis for the appropriations; is that not correct?

Mr. HORAN. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi, for whom I have the greatest affection, but let me tell him this afternoon we are going to vote on a great appropriation, or an authorization for an appropriation, and they are having a tough time telling me why I should support an authorization like that, which will take care of crickets and bugs all over the world, and then turn down our own forests and our own national resources at home. Tell me, how can you justify that?

Mr. WHITTEN, Unless they justify it to you, you should not vote for it.

Mr. HILL. If you would look at those forests, you would not have to ask anybody to justify this to you, to the extent of even a dime. You did not do it, and you had the opportunity.

Mr. WHITTEN. I will ask them to justify these expenditures to me, and I will do that as long as I am on this committee. Unless they justify it to me, I will not vote for this or any other appropriation.

Mr. HILL. Just because the Forest Service did not come before you and make a proper showing, that is no reason why the forests should be left to die as they are this very day.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to yield further because I asked for this time to report to the House that I made a reservation on this item when we reported out this bill and therefore can speak for the amendment. I am for the elimination of the bark beetle infestation in Colorado or in any other State. But the real reason why we must take care of the forests in Colorado, and throughout the Pacific Southwest States, is because we have less water in that area than we have population, and that any revegetation of the ranges, any upstream projects, or protection of the forests and the watersheds there, is vital to all of the Pacific Southwest States. I cannot state it any more clearly than that. This is as vital to the people of Los Angeles as it is to the people of Denver, and probably more so. It is vital to all of the folks who live in the Southwestern States.

I hope our Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations will be able to follow through on a program that we have tentatively set up for this fall. I trust that we can go to Hoover Dam, and see there that great relief map that they have of Hoover Dam and see the watersheds that the Colorado River drains, and then I hope we can fly over that blighted area where the forests and watersheds are in such bad shape. I trust the committee will accept the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, while I do not represent any section of the West, we do still have in the State of Minnesota considerable pine and considerable spruce. I am very much concerned in that. There has been some statement made about why this amount has been left out of this appropriation. I have heard the argument that it is because the Department did not make a sufficient showing. Regardless of whether that is true or not, I have before me a telegram in which I place much confidence. It is from one of the leading lumber men of the United States. I received this telegram this morning. On any subject dealing with lumber I think this man is well versed, from the Pacific coast to the Midwest. I want to quote this telegram for the RECORD. It is directed to several of us from Minnesota. Speaking of his experience out there, he says:

> We have no timber investments in Colorado. However, for past fortnight I have been in Colorado account of asthma. Am shocked at amount of Government-owned bug-killed spruce seen and also reported but particularly at the fact that the Government has provided no funds to fight the bugs in its own timber so far this year. At this date only about 6 weeks left to fight bugs this year. Highest efficient rate of treating is about 75,000 trees per week. Therefore, each day lost means about 10,000 dead trees to Uncle Sam. As a citizen interested in our forest supplies hope very much you will do your best to impress House conferees with importance of prompt action and approval of funds for Colorado beetle control.
>
> DAVID WINTON.

I think perhaps a number of you know or have heard of Mr. Winton. I want to lend my support and my humble plea for the curtailment of this ravishing bug, because no doubt he will extend himself to other parts of the Nation. You are going to ask me to vote very soon for billions of dollars to be spread all over the rest of the world. Here is a sample of our own neglect of one of the most valuable natural resources we have in this great country; that is, our forest land.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. I certainly approve of the gentleman's statement. I think it is wonderful that he understands this great problem. The gentleman said "Colorado." This land, as you know, does not belong to Colorado. This land belongs to the United States Federal Government, and that is why we have had a hard time making the press and the Members of the House understand that there is not an acre of this land that belongs to the State of Colorado. We as a State cannot go onto that land and perform any of the work that is necessary to be done to kill these bugs without the consent of the Federal Government. It is a Federal Government proposition and a Federal job right from the bottom.

Mr. WIER. If those bugs happen to get over into the State of Minnesota, I will blame nobody else but the Congress for permitting that to happen.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

(Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, this is one item which is representative of the one thing for which many of us have been fighting for the past few years; that is, for an adequate staff attached to the Appropriations Committee so that we could examine thoroughly into such items as they come up and really know what we are doing.

In regard to this particular item I have been doubtful all along that we have done the right thing when we eliminated all of this money. On the other hand, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is absolutely right when he will say that the evidence given to us has been very meager and inconclusive.

I do not want to do anything that will hurt any part of our great Nation. I can well see where this tree pest might prove to be of inestimable damage to the great Rocky Mountain section unless we do something about it; and, personally, this morning after thinking this matter over very carefully I believe perhaps it would be wise for the House to agree to this compromise halfway between the position of the House and that of the Senate. Let us give $1,000,000 for this work; let us prevent the infestation from spreading further. In the meantime I hope the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations will go out and look at the problem in the field before we go any further down the line to the conclusion of the $15,000,000 control project which this project entails. Personally, I would rather make a mistake in favor of spending too much, rather than too little, to preserve our national resources, and I intend to vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. I did not appreciate this grave problem at all until the Denver Post sent to all Members of the House a scale picture of one of these beetles and a piece of infested bark which came from this stricken area. Knowing the great reputation of the Denver Post and being cognizant of the fact that this progressive paper was merely interested in the preservation of our forest lands, I, therefore, came to the conclusion that something ought to be done. The evidence furnished me by the Post was enough to convince any reasonable individual that an appropriation sufficient to get the job done ought to be voted by the Congress. If what little I saw was able to sell me on the urgent need of this project, and our Forestry Division with all its facts has not been able to convince the members of the committee that there is a horrible condition there in Colorado which can easily spread into the Government-owned forest lands of other Western States, then I think we had better have some reorganization of the Forestry Service by hiring some new personnel. Remember, those spruce trees aren't subscribers of the Post nor constituents of mine, but we both are interested in their preservation. I am for the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I will tell the gentleman that we can put up a good argument either against this work or for it. It is a border-line project, and not wishing to harm the forests and natural resources, it is my opinion we should support the amendment.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Mississippi yield me a little time?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, I am a new Member, but perhaps I can point out something concerning this problem, for I have been a trained forester although I have not worked at it for about 20 years and have not followed minute developments. I have seen the chestnut trees in Pennsylvania disappear without a single hope of being able to contain the blight that struck them.

I talked recently with some representatives of the Forest Service. I believe one reason they cannot explain it to the committee to the full satisfaction of the members has been the fact that they have not found anything in the life cycle of this bug where they can contain it. They inject something at the base of the tree, something halfway up and something near the top of the tree. Of course, any area in the middle of the tree is liable to infection. Personally, I would not want to be a party in any way to blocking this program. I cannot see much hope myself in stopping it.

You take all of these precautions, then if on the particular day the beetle is evolved from the larva the wind blows the other way, it is liable to blow the beetle away from the place you are treating. I think salvation of the timber is the most important thing. I do not believe you should put the biggest pulp plant in the world up there, but I do believe there should be a pulp plant there to utilize this timber. That timber will stand there for 25 years without deterioration beyond its economic value.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it may be I do not recognize my responsibilities with regard to appropriation bills. However, I think I do. It is my understanding that it is not my duty to vote out appropriations because my friends want them or because some State wants money spent within its borders or because somebody wants to hire a lot of folks or because my colleagues are under pressure from newspapers or others. That is not the basis of voting appropriations to me.

It is said here that the Forestry Department made a poor showing on the justification for this item. But who shall I look to for justification of it? Not my friend from Kentucky who says he does not know anything about it. I have got to look to those who work with the problem, who are supposed to know what they are talking about, who are trained to know what they are talking about.

Mr. CHELF. May I say to the gentleman that I am under no pressure whatsoever from the Denver Post or anybody else. I feel the same as all the rest of my colleagues here, that apparently the forestry division either was not sufficiently interested in this problem or that they surely muffed the ball in their presentation of the facts to the gentleman's committee. If the Denver Post could give the Members such a vivid graphic picture of this with only a personal letter and some bits of infested bark, then what a golden opportunity the forestry division missed. They should have been able to really justify this claim. If you are going to do some cutting you ought to cut off some of those inefficient, ineffective fellows in forestry. I think that is the trouble, the bureaucrats are not doing a job and I think this is a concrete example of it. Too many of them are sitting around on the back of their laps doing nothing.

Mr. WHITTEN. I shall not argue with the gentleman on that point.

Proceeding further, here is the history of this matter—and I have tried to be fair; I served notice on the gentleman from Colorado that we were going to bring this back in disagreement so that we could give the House a chance to hear both sides:

Last year the Forestry Department came before our committee and asked for

in excess of $2,000,000 to handle these bark beetles in Colorado on a tree-to-tree basis at more than $2 per tree in an area bigger than New England. They told our committee that if they could treat 725,000 trees the job would be done. They said that the timber has tremendous value, that they were going to sell it to a paper mill. I cross-examined them, and their testimony was so weak that I opposed it, our committee opposed it, and the committee did not give them the money. They went before another committee and they got $2,000,000 to treat the 725,000 trees. They actually treated 850,000, and, according to their testimony, that should have done the job.

I had the matter investigated to see if I was right. The investigators came back and told me that it is a 100-percent gamble; that $2,000,000 will not begin to touch it; that instead of 725,000 trees, there were any number of trees; instead of a paper mill being in the process of locating out there, it is dependent upon the Government largely providing the funds for building a paper mill; instead of this timber being valuable as a marketable product, in 10 years they sold only $700,000 of it—I repeat, in 10 years they sold $700,000 worth of this timber.

Then the Department comes back this year, after I had made the investigation and had the evidence on them, anyway, and admitted they were wrong. "We treated 850,000 trees," they said, "and we find now instead of $2,000,000 and 725,000 trees doing the job, there are six or eight million trees; we have found that out, and we must use twelve or thirteen million dollars."

Now, let us not kid ourselves. You either ought not to give them any money or you have to give them enough money to do the job. Instead of this being a $900,000 issue this is a $12,000,000 to $13,000,000 project. If the next year the Forestry Department admits that they are as far wrong this year as they were last, it is a $75,000,000 project.

Now let us get back to business. We ought to do all we can to preserve our forests. Goodness knows, I fought on this floor trying to see that we did that, but there just is not enough money to treat our problem on a tree-to-tree basis at $2 per tree. Let them get money for research and find some program we can afford. You cannot go to the South and spend $2 a tree to eradicate the little leaf pine disease on a tree-to-tree basis. You cannot go into Ohio and pay $2 on a tree-to-tree basis to check oak wilt. You cannot go all over the West, where you have the white-pine blister rust, and spend $2 on a tree-to-tree basis. You cannot do that because we do not have enough money in the Treasury to meet this national tree-disease problem on a $2-per-tree basis.

The $1,000,000 included in this amendment will treat 500,000 trees. That leaves five or six million trees needing treatment and if the forestry department guess is correct, that will just scratch the surface.

You should spend your money where it would have a chance to do the overall job. If you are going to commit yourself to $2 per tree for every sick tree in the United States, the sky is the limit as to what you will be called on to appropriate for the Nation, for every region has its disease problems.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITTEN) there were—ayes 65, noes 70.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 222, nays 138, not voting 72, as follows:

[Roll No. 164]

YEAS—222

Aandahl	Fine	Morris
Adair	Flood	Moulder
Addonizio	Fugate	Multer
Allen, Calif.	Garmatz	Murdock
Allen, Ill.	George	Murphy
Andersen, H. Carl	Golden	Nelson
	Granger	Norblad
Anderson, Calif.	Grant	O'Brien, Ill.
Anfuso	Greenwood	O'Brien, Mich.
Angell	Hagen	O'Hara
Arends	Hale	O'Neill
Armstrong	Hall, Leonard W.	Ostertag
Aspinall		O'Toole
Ayres	Halleck	Patman
Bailey	Hand	Patten
Baker	Harden	Patterson
Baring	Harrison, Wyo.	Philbin
Barrett	Hart	Phillips
Beamer	Harvey	Poage
Beckworth	Havenner	Polk
Belcher	Hill	Potter
Bennett, Mich.	Hillings	Poulson
Berry	Hoeven	Powell
Betts	Hoffman, Ill.	Price
Bishop	Holifield	Prouty
Blackney	Holmes	Quinn
Blatnik	Horan	Rabaut
Bolton	Hull	Radwan
Bosone	Hunter	Rains
Bow	Jackson, Calif.	Rankin
Boykin	Jackson, Wash.	Reams
Bramblett	Javits	Reece, Tenn.
Bray	Jenison	Reed, N. Y.
Brown, Ga.	Jenkins	Rees, Kans.
Brown, Ohio	Jensen	Rhodes
Bryson	Johnson	Richards
Buchanan	Jonas	Riehlman
Budge	Jones, Ala.	Riley
Burdick	Judd	Roberts
Burnside	Karsten, Mo.	Robeson
Burton	Kee	Rodino
Butler	Kelley, Pa.	Rogers, Colo.
Byrne, N. Y.	Kelly, N. Y.	Rogers, Tex.
Carnahan	Keogh	Rooney
Celler	Kersten, Wis.	Roosevelt
Chelf	King	Sasscer
Chiperfield	Kirwan	Scudder
Chudoff	Klein	Shafer
Combs	Kluczynski	Sheehan
Cooley	Lane	Shelley
Crosser	Lesinski	Sheppard
Crumpacker	Lind	Short
Cunningham	Lovre	Sieminski
Dawson	McCormack	Simpson, Ill.
Deane	McGuire	Smith, Wis.
Delaney	McKinnon	Spence
Dempsey	McMullen	Springer
Denton	McVey	Staggers
D'Ewart	Mack, Ill.	Stanley
Dingell	Mack, Wash.	Steed
Dollinger	Madden	Tackett
Dolliver	Magee	Taylor
Dondero	Mansfield	Teague
Donohue	Marshall	Thompson, Tex.
Dorn	Martin, Iowa	Tollefson
Doyle	Merrow	Trimble
Eberharter	Miller, Calif.	Vail
Elliott	Miller, N. Y.	Velde
Feighan	Morano	Vursell
Fernandez	Morgan	Walter
Weichel	Williams, N. Y.	Woodruff
Wharton	Withrow	Yates
Wickersham	Wolcott	Yorty
Widnall	Wolverton	Zablocki
Wier	Wood, Idaho	

NAYS—138

Abernethy	Forand	McGrath
Andrews	Ford	Mahon
Auchincloss	Forrester	Meader
Bakewell	Frazier	Miller, Md.
Barden	Fulton	Miller, Nebr.
Bates, Ky.	Furcolo	Mills
Bates, Mass.	Gamble	Mumma
Battle	Gary	Murray, Tenn.
Beall	Gathings	Nicholson
Bender	Gavin	Norrell
Bennett, Fla.	Goodwin	Passman
Bentsen	Graham	Perkins
Boggs, Del.	Green	Pickett
Bonner	Gregory	Priest
Brooks	Gross	Ramsay
Brownson	Gwinn	Redden
Burleson	Hardy	Regan
Bush	Harris	Ribicoff
Byrnes, Wis.	Harrison, Va.	Rogers, Fla.
Camp	Hays, Ark.	Rogers, Mass.
Canfield	Heffernan	St. George
Cannon	Herlong	Schwabe
Carlyle	Heselton	Scott, Hardie
Case	Hoffman, Mich.	Scrivner
Church	Hope	Secrest
Clemente	James	Seely-Brown
Clevenger	Jarman	Sikes
Colmer	Jones, Mo.	Simpson, Pa.
Cooper	Jones, Hamilton C.	Sittler
Corbett		Smith, Miss.
Cotton	Jones, Woodrow W.	Smith, Va.
Coudert		Stefan
Cox	Kean	Stigler
Crawford	Kearney	Sutton
Curtis, Mo.	Keating	Thompson, Mich.
Curtis, Nebr.	Kennedy	
Dague	Kerr	Thornberry
Davis, Ga.	Kilburn	Van Zandt
Denny	Kilday	Vaughn
Devereux	Lanham	Vorys
Donovan	Lantaff	Watts
Doughton	Larcade	Whitten
Eaton	Latham	Wigglesworth
Evins	LeCompte	Williams, Miss.
Fallon	Lyle	Willis
Fenton	McConnell	Wilson, Tex.
Fogarty	McCulloch	Winstead

NOT VOTING—72

Abbitt	Gordon	Morton
Albert	Gore	Murray, Wis.
Allen, La.	Granahan	O'Konski
Andresen, August H.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Preston
		Reed, Ill.
Boggs, La.	Hays, Ohio	Rivers
Bolling	Hébert	Sabath
Breen	Hedrick	Sadlak
Brehm	Heller	Saylor
Buckley	Herter	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Buffett	Hess	
Busbey	Hinshaw	Smith, Kans.
Chatham	Howell	Stockman
Chenoweth	Irving	Taber
Cole, Kans.	Kearns	Talle
Cole, N. Y.	Lucas	Thomas
Davis, Tenn.	McCarthy	Towe
Davis, Wis.	McDonough	Van Pelt
DeGraffenried	McGregor	Vinson
Durham	McMillan	Welch
Ellsworth	Machrowicz	Werdel
Elston	Martin, Mass.	Wheeler
Engle	Mason	Whitaker
Fellows	Mitchell	Wilson, Ind.
Fisher	Morrison	Wood, Ga.

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Chenoweth for, with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin against.

Mr. Heller for, with Mr. McMillan against.

Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Durham against.

Mr. Hays of Ohio for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Howell for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Preston for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. Welch for, with Mr. Wood of Georgia against.

Mr. Hedrick for, with Mr. Boggs of Louisiana against.

Mr. Mitchell for, with Mr. Wheeler against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Irving with Mr. Taber.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Towe.
Mr. Bolling with Mr. Werdel.
Mr. Thomas with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Buffett.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. McDonough.
Mr. Lucas with Mr. McGregor.
Mr. deGraffenried with Mr. Mason.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Engle with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Machrowicz with Mr. Reed of Illinois.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Sadlak.
Mr. Albert with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
Mr. Gordon with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Gore with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Granahan with Mr. Elston.
Mr. Breen with Mr. Ellsworth.

Messrs. MURPHY, BYRNE of New York, JAVITS, PATTERSON, and WOLVERTON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 30: Page 26, line 12, insert:

"COOPERATIVE RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

"For artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious plants on national forests, as authorized by section 12 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (Public Law 478), $700,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: After the matter inserted by the said amendment and before the period, insert ": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available in any national forest in excess of three times the amount available for such forest from sources (including claims recognized by the act of December 29, 1950, and receipts under 16 U. S. C. 500) other than Federal sources."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 42: Page 38, line 6, strike out "That hereafter appropriations available for classing or grading any agricultural commodity without charge to the producers thereof may be reimbursed from nonadministrative funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the cost of classing or grading any such commodity for producers who are eligible to obtain Commodity Credit Corporation price support" and insert "That hereafter there may be transferred to appropriations available for classing or grading any agricultural commodity without charge to the producers thereof such sums from nonadministrative funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation as may be necessary in addition to other funds available for these purposes, such transfers to be reimbursed from subsequent appropriations therefor."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 60: Page 51, lie 25, strike out "$15,000,000" and insert "$16,500,000."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert "$16,500,000 (and the amount in the last proviso in this paragraph is increased to $2,500,000)."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 67: Page 64, line 13, insert:

"SEC. 410. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to 115, or a part thereof, full time, part time, and intermittent employees of the Department and its instrumentalities, cooperators, and collaborators receiving personnel services from the Department: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed as permitting any increase whatever in personnel officers over and above the number otherwise provided for in this act."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of August 16, 1951.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, as the House knows, this is the same report that was brought back about 6 weeks ago. We have followed the instructions of the House by returning to conference and, in conference yesterday, agreeing on the same formula for the Jensen amendment that was adopted in the Interior and Agricultural appropriation bills today.

I yield now to my distinguished friend, the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE].

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, my chairman has correctly stated the situation. The report is unanimous. As far as I know there is no disagreement, and there is no request for time on this side.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 32: Page 13, line 16, after "title", insert a colon and the following: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia shall pay by check to Freedmen's Hospital, upon the Surgeon General's request, in advance at the beginning of each quarter, such amount as the Surgeon General calculates will be earned on the basis of rates approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the care of patients certified by the District of Columbia. Bills rendered by the Surgeon General on the basis of such calculations shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment; but proper adjustment of amounts which have been paid in advance on the basis of such calculations shall be made at the end of each quarter: *Provided further*, That the Surgeon General may delegate the responsibilities imposed upon him by the foregoing proviso."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 131: Page 45, line 19, insert the following:

"SEC. 705. Where the number of passenger cars for replacement only is reduced by the provisions in this act the total number of pasenger cars in the division or department concerned will be reduced by a like number."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 131, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 705. Where the number of passenger cars for replacement only is reduced by the provisions in this act the total number of passenger cars in the division or department concerned will be reduced by a like number: *Provided*, That in no event shall the number of passenger-carrying vehicles which may be operated during the current fiscal year at the seat of Government under any appropriation or authorization in this act exceed 50 percent of the number in use as of June 30, 1951."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 132: Page 46, line 1, insert the following:

"SEC. 706. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred and and fifteen, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 132, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 706. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, except appropriations for the Public Health Service, shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of 1 such employee to 105, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my congratulations to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and its chairman upon the appointment of a subcommittee to look into the proposed consolidation of the insurance and death-claim activities of the Veterans' Administration. These activites were at one time centralized in the New York office. In 1946, under the direction of Gen. Omar Bradley, one of the ablest Administrators the Veterans' Administration has had, the activities were decentralized and dispersed among several offices for the more efficient service of the veterans. It is now proposed to again centralize the activities, this time in Philadelphia. The space, which is to be used for this recentralization, had been assigned to the Frankford Arsenal, which is a vital agency of the Army Ordnance Bureau. That agency was preparing to occupy the space last week with an essential defense activity, when it was told that the space was not available because it would be used by the Veterans' Administration for the proposed consolidation.

It is claimed there will be some economy in this change. Last week the Veterans' Administration advertised for 1,000 additional employees in Philadelphia—"experience unnecessary." We feel that this change will not be economical, and it will certainly impair the service which is now being rendered. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], our distinguished floor leader, requested me to express his interest in this inquiry to be made by the Expenditures Committee. He is opposed to the proposed consolidation and believes the committee investigation will show conclusively that it is an improper move.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I commend the gentleman for calling the attention of the House to this matter. I am not chairman of the subcommittee, but I am a member of the committee. I want to assure the gentleman that it is going to be the purpose of that subcommittee to go slowly into this matter and find out first of all, if it is in the interest of efficiency and economy to have any consolidation at all; and secondly, if it infringes upon the defense effort.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would like to join in the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Virginia and commend him for the interest and activity he has shown in this matter.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. The removal of all these veteran administration offices to Philadelphia will not only discommode and inconvenience veterans who have claims, but it will make it utterly impossible, particularly in death cases, for the dear ones of deceased veterans to get justice because the records will be unavailable and they will not be able to travel great distances to Philadelphia to validate their claims.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. I commend the gentleman on calling the attention of the House to this very important matter. I will serve on this subcommittee, and I assure him I will give it my most careful attention for I recall the last time this change took place, it was months before any service could be had on questions asked about insurance.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1951

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5113) to maintain the security and promote the foreign policy and provide for the general welfare of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations in the interest of international peace and security.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5113), with Mr. WALTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday there was pending the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: On page 2, line 22, section 101 (a) subsection (1): Strike out "$5,028,000,000" and insert "$4,828,000,000."

On page 3, line 16, strike out "$1,335,000,000" and insert "$1,035,000,000."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that my amendment be divided, in order that there may be a separate vote on each of the two subsections. That is, a separate vote on the military cut and a separate vovte on the economic cut.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the first portion of the amendment.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is a cut of $500,000,000; $200,000,000 on the military end and $300,000,000 on the economic end in the authorization for Europe.

Now, let us look first at the military side of this. Let me say that in considering any cuts to the bill which this committee has brought to the House, those of us who oppose any further cuts are at a serious disadvantage. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] yesterday said he was tired of voting for large amounts of authorizations without having every penny justified. Let me say we cannot justify, penny for penny and dollar for dollar, this appropriation because this information is a military secret. We cannot even tell you what amount of money in this military authorization will go to each of the countries involved. For this reason we are at a disadvantage when some Member says, "Let us knock $200,000,000 off of this." That appeals to the instincts of all of us to try to save money. We are in a difficult position to justify why we oppose such a cut.

First, let me tell you that throughout the entire hearings the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], the

ness loans outstanding on that date. However, 159 of the outstanding loans were loans over $500,000 and amounted to more than $253,000,000. Thus less than 1½ percent of the total number of outstanding business loans amounted to nearly one-half of the total amount of business loans outstanding on March 31, 1951, and it is in the "large loan area" that the committee believes the Corporation's lending authority should be reconsidered by the Congress for the protection of the taxpayer and the public.

Several important administrative improvements have been made which the committee feels will create a much healthier atmosphere in and around the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and regain the confidence of the general public. The public interest is being made a condition precedent to all loans, full publicity is being given to all successful loan applicants, employment of its personnel by borrowers has been prohibited, and last but not least some employees have been dismissed because of the "impropriety" of their actions.

As commendable as these actions are, the committee nevertheless believes that these and other changes should be enacted into law to make them fully effective. The committee feels very strongly that the control over the Corporations' activities should be strengthened by amending present law to prohibit the Corporation from sharing responsibility for certain types of loans with other Government agencies. This would centralize the authority to make such loans and should free the Corporation from the severe criticism it might otherwise receive in connection with some of these loans.

The committee is likewise convinced that the financial structure of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation should be substantially revised. The Corporation is presently capitalized at $100,000,000 with funds supplied by the Treasury, and in addition has an authorized lending authority of $1,243,000,000.

The committee supports the view of the Comptroller General and the Hoover Commission task force on Federal lending that the capital fund and lending authority should be terminated by the Congress and the Corporation financed by a revolving fund made available through appropriations. This would definitely put all of the Corporation's lending programs under the scrutiny of the appropriations committees of both Houses of the Congress, and would place the Corporation's activities more directly under the control of the Congress than they are at the present time. A case in point is the proposal of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to lend money to the States and their political subdivisions for the construction of bomb shelters. The Congress denied funds for this purpose in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951. On March 16, 1951, the Administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration testified that his agency would emphasize the shoring up of existing buildings "instead of digging a hole in the ground and filling it up with concrete." He estimated the cost of protecting 1 percent of the population would amount to $3,000,000,000 if the people were put into deep community shelters and to fully protect the entire population would cost about $300,000,000,000, which he termed fantastic because there is not enough labor, steel, and concrete in the country to do it. Under these circumstances the committee does not think that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation should lend money for the construction of bomb shelters, certainly not until a national policy concerning the construction of bomb shelters has been determined by the Congress.

The committee is not at all satisfied with the present relationship between the Washington office and the field offices. There are several important reasons for this feeling of dissatisfaction, the most recent being the Corporation's action of June 27, 1951, rescinding the long-standing authority of agency managers in the field to approve loans up to $100,000 and requiring all loans except disaster loans to be approved in Washington. The reason given for this order was to assure uniformity of actions under the Corporation's new lending policy outlined in Bulletin No. 2101. (See p. 72 of the hearings.) While the committee agrees there must be a uniform operating policy within the Reconstruction Finance Corporation it does not agree that this is the way to accomplish this objective. Unquestionably the Washington office is finding it difficult to coordinate its actions with those of its field offices not only in the instance cited here but also in such important matters as budgeting, financial reporting and record keeping. Therefore, the committee directs the Administrator to make a detailed study of the Corporation's field organization and operation, placing special emphasis on the field relationships with the Washington office and submit a complete report on his findings and recommendations to the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, prior to the hearings on the Corporation's 1953 budget estimate.

Program high lights

[In millions of dollars]

	1940 actual	1951 estimate	1952 estimate
Business loans:			
(Commitments (Direct Business loans)	299.0	160.0	289.0
Disbursements	234.8	201.4	318.0
Repayments	94.9	218.8	125.0
Outstanding at June 30	444.3	416.1	594.1
Net profit for the year (lending operations)	19.8	5.3	6.1
Synthetic rubber program:			
Cost of operations	155.6	282.6	508.5
Sales	156.0	303.5	517.5
Tin program:			
Cost of operations	152.1	86.0	125.8
Sales	141.2	110.2	126.0

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the individual views of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], who unfortunately cannot be present, regarding the minority views of the subcommittee on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, be printed and made a part of the report which I have just submitted to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1952—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of August 16, 1951, pp. 10409–10411.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 3973, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
August 17, 1951.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 42 and 67 to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$2,700,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: After the matter inserted by the said amendment and before the period, insert: ": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available in any national forest in excess of three times the amount available for such forest from sources (including claims recognized by the act of December 29, 1950, and receipts under 16 U. S. C. 500) other than Federal sources."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert "$16,500,000 (and the amount in the last proviso in this paragraph is increased to $2,500,000)."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 21, 30, and 60.

The motion was agreed to.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1922—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report see House proceedings of August 16, 1951, pp. 10346–10350.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the

Senate to House bill 3709, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S., *August 17, 1951.*

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, to the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 131, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 705. Where the number of passenger cars for replacement only is reduced by the provisions in this act the total number of passenger cars in the division or department concerned will be reduced by a like number: *Provided*, That in no event shall the number of passenger-carrying vehicles which may be operated during the current fiscal year at the seat of government under any appropriation or authorization in this act exceed 50 percent of the number in use as of June 30, 1951."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 132, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 706. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, except appropriations for the Public Health Service, shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of 1 such employee to 105, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 131 and 132.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Just what business was transacted a moment ago?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Action was taken on the conference report on the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill. There was only one disagreement which amounted to anything, and that was with respect to the so-called Jensen amendment, to which both Houses agreed in a modified form.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the conferees sign a unanimous report?

Mr. CHAVEZ. They certainly did. The report is signed by the conferees on the part of the House and the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. The reason I ask the question is that it was my understanding that there was a question with respect to removing the limitations on personal services in several instances.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The so-called Jensen amendment was reported in disagreement. The form in which it was finally agreed to represented partly the Jensen amendment and partly the Ferguson amendment. The following is the form in which the amendment with respect to personnel, about which the Senator from Nebraska is speaking, was agreed to. Section 706, as agreed to, reads as follows:

SEC. 706. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, except appropriations for the Public Health Service, shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred and five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half-time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

The conferees agreed on that language, but it had to be taken back to the House because of a technical disagreement. Later the House agreed to it.

Mr. WHERRY. The amendments to which I referred were amendments numbered 13, 20, 23, 25, 26, and so forth.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The amendments to which the Senator refers have to do with public health items, and the conferees were in complete agreement on those.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

MINORITY VIEWS OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I send to the desk minority views signed by myself and the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. The views are entitled "Minority Final Report of the Subcommittee on Reconstruction Finance Corporation of the Committee on Banking and Currency, Pursuant to Senate Resolution 219, Eighty-first Congress." I ask that the minority views be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; gladly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Am I to understand that the views submitted by the Senator from Indiana are to be made a part of the document to which I have just referred?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes. I am glad the Senator from Arkansas has called my attention to that fact. I should like to state my understanding of the vote in the subcommittee. A majority report has been filed. I now file my minority views. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] has filed his individual views. Other Senators are given an opportunity, until Thursday noon, to file individual views or minority views. The majority report, the minority views, and the individual views will be printed as one document. That, I believe, is exactly in line with the vote of the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. President, inasmuch as I was handed this morning, for the first time, the individual views of the junior Senator from Connecticut, I ask unanimous consent to answer his individual views. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that my answer be printed as a part of the official document to which reference has been made, as though I had filed the reply with the Senate as a part of my minority views.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not quite understand the request of the Senator from Indiana, or the significance of it.

Mr. CAPEHART. I hold in my hand the individual views of the Senator from Connecticut, which were filed with the Senate today. They will be printed as a part of the document containing the majority report and the minority views of the committee. I am asking that my remarks in respect to the individual views of the Senator from Connecticut be likewise printed as part of the document.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am not certain whether such a request is in accord with the agreement of the members of the committee. It would be in the nature of surrebuttal, it seems to me. As I recall the action of the committee, additional views were to be limited to individual views and minority views.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should think that what I was about to state would by my individual views.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have no personal objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana, but it would seem to me that there would have to be some limit placed on the number of individual views which may be printed as a part of the document.

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe no limit has been placed on the number of individual views which may be filed up to Thursday noon.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has reference to individual views with respect to the minority views. The minority views had been made available to the committee late on Thursday. I am not clear whether the request of the Senator from Indiana is in accord with the vote of the committee on that subject.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then I shall withdraw my request, and I shall talk upon the subject. In that way my views will go into the RECORD. Subsequently I shall file my individual views, which will be made a part of the complete report, as I have a right to do, provided I do so before Thursday noon.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not wish to be put in the position of objecting to the request of the Senator from Indiana. I am trying to clarify the effect of the vote of the subcommittee. I do not wish to object to the request of the Senator from Indiana. I am only stating that I am not clear with respect to my understanding of the vote of the committee in that respect. I believe the staff of the committee should be consulted.

Public Law 135 - 82d Congress
Chapter 374 - 1st Session
H. R. 3973

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

TITLE I—REGULAR ACTIVITIES

Research and Marketing Act of 1946

To enable the Secretary to improve and develop, independently or through cooperation among Federal and State agencies, and others, a sound and efficient system for the distribution and marketing of agricultural products under the provisions of titles II and III of the Act of August 14, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1621–1629), $4,750,000: *Provided*, That not less than $600,000 of this amount shall be available for contracts in accordance with the provisions of section 205 of said Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may make available to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry out the functions for which it is made (but amounts made available to the Office of the Secretary, Office of the Solicitor, and Office of Information, shall not exceed those which the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine), and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to other appropriation items of the Department: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof, except for the support of equitable transportation rates before Federal agencies concerned with such rates and for development of foreign markets.

Bureau of Agricultural Economics

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Act establishing the Bureau of Agricultural Economics (7 U. S. C. 411) and related Acts, as follows:

Economic investigations: For conducting investigations and for acquiring and diffusing useful information among the people of the United States, relative to agricultural production, distribution, land utilization, and conservation in their broadest aspects, including farm management and practice, utilization of farm and food products, purchasing of farm supplies, farm population and rural life, farm labor, farm finance, insurance and taxation, adjustments in production to probable demand for the different farm and food products; land ownership and values, costs, prices and income in their relation to agriculture, including causes for their variations and trends, $2,150,000: *Provided*, that no part of the funds herein appropriated or made available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics under the heading "Economic investigations" shall be used for State and county land-use planning, for conducting cultural surveys, or for the maintenance of regional offices.

Crop and livestock estimates: For collecting, compiling, abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and publishing data relat-

ing to agriculture, including crop and livestock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, staples of cotton, stocks, and value of farm crops and numbers, grades, and value of livestock and livestock products on farms, production, distribution, and consumption of turpentine and rosin pursuant to the Act of August 15, 1935 (5 U. S. C. 556b), and for the collection and publication of statistics of peanuts as provided by the Act approved June 24, 1936, as amended May 12, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 951–957), $2,848,304: *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for any expense incident to ascertaining, collating, or publishing a report stating the intention of farmers as to the acreage to be planted in cotton, or for estimates of apple production for other than the commercial crop.

Agricultural Research Administration

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

For necessary expenses of the Office of Administrator, including travel and subsistence expenses of advisory committees authorized by title III of the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 1628–1629), and the maintenance, operation, and furnishing of facilities and services at the Agricultural Research Center, $541,440: *Provided*, That the appropriation current at the time services are rendered may be reimbursed (by advance credits or reimbursements based on estimated or actual charges) from applicable appropriations, to cover the charges, including handling and other related services, for equipment rentals (including depreciation, maintenance, and repairs); for services, supplies, equipment, and material furnished: *Provided further*, That of the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research Administration, not to exceed $15,000 shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further*, That the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research Administration shall be available for the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and improvements: *Provided, however*, That unless otherwise provided, the cost of constructing any one building (excepting headhouses connecting greenhouses and experimental farm houses) shall not exceed $5,000, the total amount for construction of buildings costing more than $2,500 each shall be within the limits of the estimates submitted and approved therefor, and the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed $2,500 or 2 per centum of the cost of the building as certified by the Research Administrator, whichever is greater, except for the alteration of one building at Greenfield, Massachusetts, at a cost not to exceed $7,500: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 7 per centum of the funds of any research appropriation of the Agricultural Research Administration, including the appropriation for the Office of the Administrator, may be transferred by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary, to any other such research appropriation in order to provide for a more effective research program: *Provided, however*, That no appropriation may be increased more than 7 per centum by such transfers.

RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to conduct research into the basic agricultural needs and problems of the Territory of Alaska, through such agencies of the Department as he may designate, independently or in cooperation with appropriate agencies of the Territory of Alaska, $250,000.

OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico

For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico to be paid quarterly in advance where applicable, to carry into effect the provisions of the following Acts relating to agricultural experiment stations:

Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U. S. C. 362, 363, 365, 368, 377–379), $720,000; Adams Act, the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369), $720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24, 1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373–376, 380, 382), $2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), sections 3 and 5, $2,863,708, and sections 9 and 11 of said Act as added by the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427h, 427j), including administration by the Office of Experiment Stations in the United States Department of Agriculture, $5,000,000, no part of which latter amount shall be used for beginning construction of any building costing in excess of $15,000, except that a poultry breeding house may be constructed at Purdue University at a cost to this appropriation of not to exceed $29,000; Hawaii, the Act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386–386b), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii, $90,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Hatch Act to the Territory of Alaska, $15,000, and the provisions of section 2 of the Act approved June 20, 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 369a, Public Law 739, approved August 29, 1950), extending the benefits of the Adams and Purnell Acts to the Territory of Alaska, $50,000; Puerto Rico, the Act approved March 4, 1931, as amended (7 U. S. C. 386d–386f), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, $12,428,708.

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses in connection with administration of grants and coordination of research with States pursuant to the Acts approved March 2, 1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May 16, 1928, February 23, 1929, March 4, 1931, and June 20, 1936, and Acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361–363, 365–383, 386–386f), and title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended by the Act of September 21, 1944 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), and for the administration, operation, and maintenance of an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, $367,090; and the Secretary shall prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required under the above Acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the research work of the State agricultural colleges and experiment stations in the lines authorized in said Acts with research of the Department in similar lines, and make report thereon to Congress.

BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

For necessary expenses in connection with conducting investigations of the relative utility and economy of agricultural products for food, clothing, and other uses in the home, with special suggestions of plans and methods for the more effective utilization of such products for these purposes, and such economic investigations, including housing and household buying, as have for their purpose the improvement of the rural home, for coordinating nutrition services made available by

Federal, State, and other agencies, and for disseminating useful information on these subjects, $1,350,000.

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act, as amended, establishing a Bureau of Animal Industry, and related Acts, and for investigation concerned with the livestock and meat industries and the domestic raising of fur-bearing animals, as follows:

Animal research: For animal husbandry investigations; investigations of diseases of animals and of tuberculin, serums, antitoxins, and analogous products; and cooperation in the administration of regulations for the improvement of poultry, poultry products, and hatcheries, as authorized by law (7 U. S. C. 429, Public Law 662, approved August 4, 1950); $3,250,000.

Animal disease control and eradication: For the control and eradication of tuberculosis and paratuberculosis of animals, avian tuberculosis, Bang's disease of cattle, scabies in sheep and cattle, southern cattle ticks, hog cholera and related swine diseases, and dourine in horses, and other inspection and quarantine work authorized by law; for supervision of the transportation of livestock, including administration of the twenty-eight-hour law; for inspection of vessels; and for carrying out the provisions of the Act of March 4, 1913 (21 U. S. C. 151–158), relating to veterinary biological products, $7,731,022, including $30,000 for the acquisition of land and construction of buildings for inspection of livestock at Canadian border ports of entry: *Provided*, That no payment hereunder as compensation for any cattle condemned for slaughter for tuberculosis, paratuberculosis, or Bang's disease shall exceed (1) $25 for any grade animal or $50 for any pure bred animal, (2) one-third of the difference between the appraised value and the value of salvage thereof, or (3) the amount paid or to be paid by the State or other cooperating agency, and no payment hereunder shall be made for any animal if at the time of test or condemnation it shall belong to or be upon the premises of any person, firm, or corporation to which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered for slaughter.

Marketing agreements, hog cholera virus and serum: For carrying into effect sections 56 to 60, inclusive, of the Act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 851–855) regulating the marketing of anti-hog-cholera serum and hog-cholera virus, $47,906.

Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of laws relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat-food products, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only, $12,800,000: *Provided*, That hereafter reimbursement may be made by any person, firm, or organization for the expenses of meat inspection in excess of those which can be met from the amount appropriated for such purposes each year.

BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Act of May 29, 1924 (7 U. S. C. 401–404), including investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in dairy industry, the applicable provisions of the Act of May 9, 1902 (26 U. S. C. 2325, 2326 (c)), relating to process or renovated butter, as amended, and the Act of May 23, 1908 (21 U. S. C. 94 (a)), insofar as it relates to the exportation of process or renovated butter, $1,475,000.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments, and demonstrations established under the provisions of section 202 (a) to 202 (e), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1292); for the development of new and extended food, feed, and industrial uses for agricultural commodities, both plant and animal, and potential replacement crops, and processing, biological, chemical, physical, pharmacological, toxicological, and technological investigation thereof, $7,250,000.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

Plant, soil, and agricultural engineering research: For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments, and demonstrations concerning plants, soils, and agricultural engineering, including those related to the production, improvement, handling, processing, transportation, and storage of farm and other crops; control of weeds, plant diseases, and nematodes; discovery and introduction of new and useful plants, both foreign and native; soil and water management to improve soil productivity; the relation of soils to plant, animal, and human nutrition; classification and mapping of soils; fertilizers, liming materials, and soil amendments; farm machinery and processing equipment; farm buildings, and farm electrification; and for the operation and maintenance of airplanes; $10,589,730, including not to exceed $275,000 for the construction of a laboratory at Orlando, Florida.

National Arboretum: For the maintenance and development of the National Arboretum established under the provisions of the Act approved March 4, 1927 (20 U. S. C. 191–194), $136,920.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments, demonstrations, and surveys for the promotion of economic entomology, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of destroying insects and related pests injurious to agriculture, for importing useful and beneficial insects and bacterial, fungal, and other diseases of insects and related pests, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of destroying insects affecting man and animals, and the best ways of utilizing beneficial insects, for carrying into effect the provisions of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), the Honey Bee Act (7 U. S. C. 281–283), the Insect Pest Act (7 U. S. C. 141–144), the Mexican Border Act (7 U. S. C. 149), and the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), as amended, authorizing the eradication, control, and prevention of spread of injurious insects and plant pests; including the operation and maintenance of airplanes and the purchase of not to exceed two, as follows:

Insect investigations: For the investigation of insects affecting fruits, grapes, nuts, trees, shrubs, forests and forest products, truck and garden crops, cereal, forage and range crops, cotton, tobacco, sugar plants, ornamental and other plants and agricultural products, household possessions, and man and animals; for bee culture and apiary management; for classifying, identifying, and collecting information to determine the distribution and abundance of insects; for investigations in connection with introduction of natural enemies of injurious insects and related pests and for the exchange with other countries of useful and beneficial insects and other arthropods; for

developing methods, equipment, and apparatus to aid in enforcing plant quarantines and in the eradication and control of insect pests and plant diseases; and for investigations of insecticides and fungicides, including methods of their manufacture and use and the effects of their application, $3,650,000: *Provided*, That of the amount allotted for oriental fruitfly, not to exceed $250,000 may be used for contracts with public or private agencies for research in accordance with section 10 (a) of the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427i), and the amounts obligated for contract research shall remain available until expended.

Insect and plant-disease control: For carrying out operations or measures to eradicate, suppress, control, or to prevent or retard the spread of Japanese beetle, sweetpotato weevil, Mexican fruitflies, phony peach and peach mosaic, cereal rusts, pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil, golden nematode, citrus blackfly, white-fringed beetle, Hall scale, and gypsy and brown-tail moths, including the enforcement of quarantine regulations and cooperation with States to enforce plant quarantines as authorized by the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), and including the establishment of such cotton-free areas as may be necessary to stamp out any infestation of the pink bollworm as authorized by the Act of February 8, 1930 (46 Stat. 67), and for cooperation with States in the compensation of growers for losses resulting from the destruction of or for not planting potatoes and tomatoes on lands infested or exposed to infestations of the golden nematode for the purpose authorized by the Golden Nematode Act (Public Law 645, approved June 15, 1948), $4,600,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees, farm animals, farm crops, or other property injured or destroyed, except potatoes and tomatoes as authorized under the Golden Nematode Act: *Provided further*, That, in the discretion of the Secretary, no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the control of sweetpotato weevil in any State until such State has provided cooperation necessary to accomplish this purpose, or for barberry eradication until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States, counties, or local authorities, or by individuals or organizations for the accomplishment of this purpose, or with respect to the golden nematode except as prescribed in section 4 of the Golden Nematode Act.

Plant quarantines: For operations against the introduction of insect pests or plant diseases into the United States, including the enforcement of foreign-plant quarantines and regulations promulgated under sections 5 and 7 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), the Insect Pest Act of 1905 (7 U. S. C. 141–144), and the Mexican Border Act of 1942 (7 U. S. C. 149), for enforcement of domestic-plant quarantines as they pertain to Territories and districts of the United States, for the enforcement of plant quarantines through inspection in transit, including the interception and disposition of materials found to have been transported in violation of Federal plant quarantine laws or regulations, and operations under the Terminal Inspection Act (7 U. S. C. 166) and enforcement of regulations governing the movement of plants into and from the District of Columbia promulgated under section 15 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended, and for inspection and certification of plants and plant products to meet the sanitary requirements of foreign countries, as authorized in section 102 of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), $2,600,000.

Control of Emergency Outbreaks of Insects and Plant Diseases

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 148–148e), including the operation and maintenance of airplanes and the purchase of not to exceed two, and surveys and control operations in Canada in cooperation with the Canadian Government or local Canadian authorities, and the employment of Canadian citizens, $1,800,000, of which $1,000,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, for the purposes of said joint resolution only to the extent that the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency conditions.

CONTROL OF FOREST PESTS

For expenses necessary for carrying out operations, measures, or surveys necessary to eradicate, suppress, control, or to prevent or retard the spread of insects or diseases which endanger forest trees on any lands in the United States, and for such quarantine measures relating thereto as may be necessary pursuant to the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), including the purchase (not to exceed two) and operation and maintenance of airplanes, and construction and alteration of necessary buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of constructing or altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed $2,500, as follows:

Forest Pest Control Act: For carrying out the provisions of the Act approved June 25, 1947 (16 U. S. C., Supp. I, 594–1—594–5), $2,700,000, of which $500,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, for the purposes of said Act only to the extent that the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency conditions.

White pine blister rust: White pine blister rust, pursuant to the Act of April 26, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 594a), $3,300,000, of which $505,000 shall be available to the Department of the Interior for the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering Federal lands under the jurisdiction of that Department or lands of Indian tribes which are under the jurisdiction of or retained under restrictions of the United States; $1,750,000 to the Forest Service for the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering lands under its jurisdiction; and $1,045,000 to the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine for leadership and general coordination of the entire program, method development, and for operations conducted under its direction for such control, including, but not confined to, the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering State and privately owned lands.

FOREST SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary, including not to exceed $10,000 for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); to experiment and make investigations and report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and lumbering, but no part of this appropriation shall be used for any experiment or test made outside the jurisdiction of the United States; to advise the owners of woodlands as to the proper care of the same; to investigate and test American timber and timber trees and their uses, and methods for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek, through investiga-

tions and the planting of native and foreign species, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to erect necessary buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost (not to exceed $1,000) of constructing a water-supply or sanitary system and of connecting the same with any such building, and exclusive of the cost of any tower upon which a lookout house may be erected, shall not exceed $15,000, with the exception that any building erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was $15,000 or more, may be improved out of the appropriations made under this Act for the Forest Service by an amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such building as certified by the Chief of the Forest Service; to protect, administer, and improve the national forests, including tree planting and other measures to prevent erosion, drift, surface wash, soil waste, and the formation of floods, and to conserve water; to ascertain the natural conditions upon and utilize the national forests, to transport and care for fish and game supplied to stock the national forests or the waters therein; to collate, digest, report, and illustrate the results of experiments and investigations made by the Forest Service, as follows:

National forest protection and management: For the administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement, and development of the national forests, including the establishment and maintenance of forest tree nurseries, including the procurement of tree seed and nursery stock by purchase, production, or otherwise, seeding and tree planting and the care of plantations and young growth; the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed three; the maintenance of roads and trails and the construction and maintenance of all other improvements necessary for the proper and economical administration, protection, development, and use of the national forests, including experimental areas under Forest Service administration, except that where direct purchases will be more economical than construction, improvements may be purchased; the construction (not to exceed $15,000 for any one structure), equipment, and maintenance of sanitary and recreational facilities; timber cultural operations; development and application of fish and game management plans; propagation and transplanting of plants suitable for planting on semiarid portions of the national forests; estimating and appraising of timber and other resources and development and application of plans for their effective management, sale, and use; expenses of the National Forest Reservation Commission as authorized by section 14 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 514); examination, classification, surveying, and appraisal of land incident to effecting exchanges authorized by law and of lands within the boundaries of the national forests that may be opened to homestead settlement and entry under the Act of June 11, 1906, and the Act of August 10, 1912 (16 U. S. C. 506–509), as provided by the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C. 512); investigation and establishment of water rights, including the purchase thereof or of lands or interests in lands or rights-of-way for use and protection of water rights necessary or beneficial in connection with the administration and public use of the national forests; and all expenses necessary for the use, maintenance, improvement, protection, and general administration of the national forests, $27,322,025, of which not to exceed $75,000 shall be available for the purchase of three nursery sites.

Fighting forest fires: For fighting and preventing forest fires on or threatening lands under Forest Service administration, including lands under contract for purchase or in process of condemnation for Forest Service purposes, and for liquidation of obligations incurred in the preceding fiscal year for such purpose, $6,000,000, of which

$2,500,000 shall be apportioned for use, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, only to the extent that the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency conditions.

Forest research: For forest research at forest or range experiment stations, the Forest Products Laboratory, or elsewhere, in accordance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the Act approved May 22, 1928, as amended (16 U. S. C. 581, 581a, 581f–581i), including the construction and maintenance of improvements; fire, silvicultural, watershed, and other forest investigations and experiments; investigations and experiments to develop improved methods of management of forest and other ranges; experiments, investigations, and tests of forest products; a comprehensive forest survey; and investigations in forest economics; $5,108,603: *Provided*, That hereafter funds may be received from any State, other political subdivision, organization, or individual for the purpose of establishing or operating any forest research facility located within the United States, its Territories, or possessions.

FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act approved November 9, 1921, as amended (23 U. S. C. 23, 23a), relating to forest development roads and trails, including the construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of roads and trails on experimental areas under Forest Service administration, $13,000,000, which sum is authorized to be appropriated by the Acts of June 29, 1948 (Public Law 834), and September 7, 1950 (Public Law 769), to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the rental, purchase, construction, or alteration of buildings necessary for the storage and repair of equipment and supplies used for road and trail construction and maintenance, but the total cost of any such building purchased, altered, or constructed under this authorization shall not exceed $15,000 with the exception that any building erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was $15,000 or more, may be improved within any fiscal year by an amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such buildings certified by the Chief of the Forest Service.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

Weeks Act

For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the Act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U. S. C. 513–519, 521), $75,000, to be available only for payment toward the purchase price of any lands acquired, including the cost of surveys in connection with such acquisition: *Provided*, That no part of such funds shall be used for the purchase of lands in the counties of Adair, Cherokee, and Sequoyah, in the State of Oklahoma, without the specific approval of the Board of County Commissioners of the county in which such lands are situated.

Superior National Forest

For the acquisition of forest land within the Superior National Forest, Minnesota, under the provisions of the Act approved June 22, 1948 (Public Law 733), $125,000, to remain available until expended.

88520 O - 51 - 2

Special Acts

For the acquisition of land to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior boundaries of the following national forests, in accordance with the provisions of the following Acts authorizing annual appropriations of forest receipts for such purposes, and in not to exceed the following amounts from such receipts: Uinta and Wasatch National Forests, Utah, Act of August 26, 1935 (Public Law 337), as amended, $39,830; Cache National Forest, Utah, Act of May 11, 1938 (Public Law 505), as amended, $10,000; San Bernardino and Cleveland National Forests, Riverside County, California, Act of June 15, 1938 (Public Law 634), as amended, $22,000; Nevada and Toiyabe National Forests, Nevada, Act of June 25, 1938 (Public Law 748), as amended, $10,000; Angeles National Forest, California, Act of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 591), $20,000; Cleveland National Forest, San Diego County, California, Act of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 589), $5,000; Sequoia National Forest, California, Act of June 17, 1940 (Public Law 637), $34,850; in all $141,680.

STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

For expenses necessary for cooperation with the various States in forest-fire prevention and suppression, in forest tree planting, in forest management and processing, and in farm forestry extension, pursuant to the Act of August 25, 1950 (Public Law 729), and sections 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the Act of June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 564–568a), and Acts supplementary thereto; advising timberland owners, associations, and other appropriate agencies in the application of forest management principles to federally owned lands leased to States and to private forest lands, and advising wood-using industries in processing of forest products, so as to attain sustained-yield management, the conservation of the timber resources, the productivity of forest lands, and the stabilization of employment and economic continuance of forest industries; $10,750,000.

COOPERATIVE RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious plants on national forests, as authorized by section 12 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (Public Law 478), $700,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available in any national forest in excess of three times the amount available for such forest from sources (including claims recognized by the Act of December 29, 1950, and receipts under 16 U. S. C. 500) other than Federal sources.

Flood Control

For expenses necessary, in accordance with the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law 738), as amended and supplemented, to make preliminary examinations and surveys, and to perform works of improvement, and to plan the agricultural phases of the development of the Columbia Basin area, the Arkansas-White-Red River area, and the New England–New York area, in accordance with the provisions of laws relating to the activities of the Department, including not to exceed $100,000 for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C.

55a), to remain available until expended, $6,372,800, with which shall be merged the unexpended balances of funds heretofore appropriated or transferred to the Department for flood-control purposes: *Provided*, That no part of such funds shall be used for the purchase of lands in the Yazoo and Little Tallahatchie watersheds without specific approval of the county board of supervisors of the county in which such lands are situated, nor shall any part of such funds be used for the purchase of lands in the counties of Adair, Cherokee, and Sequoyah, in the State of Oklahoma, without the specific approval of the Board of County Commissioners of the county in which such lands are situated: *Provided further*, That of the funds available herein, not in excess of $6,000,000 (with which shall be merged the unexpended balance of funds heretofore made available for these purposes) may be expended in watersheds heretofore authorized by section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, for necessary gully control, floodwater detention, and floodway structures in areas other than those over which the Department of the Army has jurisdiction and responsibility.

Soil Conservation Service

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for carrying out the provisions of the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f), title III of the Act of July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010–1012), and the Act of August 11, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 1011 note), including research and investigations into the character, cause, extent, history, and effects of erosion, soil and moisture depletion, and methods of soil and water conservation (including the construction and hydrologic phases of farm irrigation and land drainage, and the construction, operation, and maintenance of experimental watersheds, stations, laboratories, plots, and installations); making conservation surveys and plans and establishing measures to conserve soil and water (including farm irrigation and land drainage and such special measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs); establishment and operation of conservation nurseries; development and management of land utilization project lands and facilities; dissemination of information; purchase and erection or alteration of permanent buildings; operation and maintenance of aircraft; and furnishing of subsistence to employees; $53,474,991: *Provided*, That the cost of any permanent building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing a water supply or sanitary system and connecting the same to any such building and with the exception of buildings acquired in conjunction with land being purchased for other purposes, shall not exceed $2,500, except for eight buildings to be constructed or improved at a cost not to exceed $15,000 per building and except that alterations or improvements to other existing permanent buildings costing $2,500 or more may be made in any fiscal year in an amount not to exceed $500 per building: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the construction of any such building on land not owned by the Government: *Provided further*, That in the State of Missouri, where the State has established a central State agency authorized to enter into agreements with the United States or any of its agencies on policies and general programs for the saving of its soil by the extension of Federal aid to any soil conservation district in such State, the agreements made by or on behalf of the United States with any such soil conservation district shall have the prior approval of such central State agency before they shall become effective as to such district: *Provided further*, That no part of this appro-

priation may be expended for soil and water conservation operations under the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f), in demonstration projects: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $5,000 may be used for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further*, That not to exceed $265,000 of funds authorized for fiscal year 1951 for development of land utilization projects may remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That qualified local engineers may be temporarily employed at per diem rates to perform the technical planning work of the service.

WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

For expenses necessary to carry into effect the functions of the Department under the Acts of May 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 685, 719), October 14, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 590y–z–10), as amended and supplemented, June 28, 1949 (Public Law 132), and September 6, 1950 (Public Law 760), relating to water conservation and utilization projects, to remain available until expended, $235,500, which sum shall be merged with the unexpended balances of funds heretofore appropriated or transferred to said Department for the purposes of said Act.

Production and Marketing Administration

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q), including not to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; $260,000,000, to remain available until December 31 of the next succeeding fiscal year for compliance with the program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conserving practices authorized under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1951, carried out during the period July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1951, inclusive: *Provided*, That not to exceed $25,250,000 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such program, the cost of aerial photographs, however, not to be charged to such limitation; but not more than $4,966,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further*, That payments to claimants hereunder may be made upon the certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the conservation practice or practices and has complied with all other requirements as conditions for such payments and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of title 18, United States Code: *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order Numbered 9069, of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information at the county level to individual farmers:

Provided further, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1952 program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conserving practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended (amounting to $256,500,000, including administration, and formulated on the basis of a distribution of the funds available for payments and grants among the several States in accordance with their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary, except that the proportion allocated to any State shall not be reduced more than 15 per centum from the distribution for the next preceding program year, and no participant shall receive more than $2,500); but the payments or grants under such programs shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State committees appointed pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590h (b)), for the respective States: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 5 per centum of the allocation for the agricultural conservation program for any county may, on the recommendation of such county committee and approval of the State committee, be withheld and allotted to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program in the participating counties, and the funds so allotted may be placed in a single account for each State, and shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such counties: *Provided further*, That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary under programs provided for herein: *Provided further*, That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department, shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of title 18, United States Code, section 1913, to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION PROGRAMS

To enable the Secretary to formulate and carry out acreage allotment and marketing quota programs pursuant to provisions of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1301–1393), including the measurement of the acreage planted to cotton on the farms whether or not marketing quotas are in effect, providing that not more than $1,000,000 shall be available for this purpose, and to provide assistance in obtaining equipment, materials, and facilities necessary to attain needed production of agricultural

commodities, $10,000,000, of which not more than $2,800,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938".

SUGAR ACT PROGRAM

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948 (7 U. S. C. 1101–1160), $70,000,000, to remain available until June 30 of the next succeeding fiscal year: *Provided*, That expenditures (including transfers) from this appropriation for other than payments to sugar producers shall not exceed $1,500,000.

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act (42 U. S. C. 1751–1760), $83,367,491: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for nonfood assistance under section 5 of said Act.

MARKETING SERVICES

For expenses necessary for acquiring and diffusing market information on agricultural commodities, food products and by-products, the standardization, classification, grading, handling, storage and marketing thereof, including the demonstration and promotion of the use of uniform standards of classification of American farm and food products throughout the world, the analysis of cotton fiber, the classing of cotton for producer members of cotton quality improvement groups, the establishment of classification standards and maintenance of an inspection service for tobacco (7 U. S. C. 471–476, 501–508, 511–511q); for investigating and certifying, in one or more jurisdictions, to shippers and other interested parties the class, quality, and condition of any agricultural commodity or food product, whether raw or processed, and any product containing an agricultural commodity or derivative thereof when offered for interstate shipment or when received at such important central markets as the Secretary may from time to time designate, or at points which may be conveniently reached therefrom under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, including the collection of such fees as are reasonable and as nearly as may cover the cost of the service rendered; for performing the duties imposed upon the Secretary by chapter 14 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to cotton futures (26 U. S. C. 1920–1935); and for carrying into effect the United States Cotton Standards Act (7 U. S. C. 51–65), the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U. S. C. 71–87), the Naval Stores Act (7 U. S. C. 91–99), section 201 (a) to 201 (d), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1291), including not to exceed $25,000 for employment at rates not to exceed $100 per diem, pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a), of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), the Acts to provide standards for containers for fruits and vegetables (15 U. S. C. 251–257i), the United States Warehouse Act (7 U. S. C. 241–273), the Federal Seed Act (7 U. S. C. 1551–1610), the Packers and Stockyards Act (7 U. S. C. 181–229), the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U. S. C. 135–135k), and the Tobacco Plant and Seed Exportation Act (7 U. S. C. 516), $10,800,000: *Provided*, That hereafter there may be transferred to appropriations available for classing or grading any agricultural commodity without charge to the producers thereof such sums from nonadministrative funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation as

may be necessary in addition to other funds available for these purposes, such transfers to be reimbursed from subsequent appropriations therefor.

Commodity Exchange Authority

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1–17a), $650,000.

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation

For operating and administrative expenses, $7,949,911.

Rural Electrification Administration

To carry into effect the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–924), as follows:

LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS

For loans in accordance with said Act, and for carrying out the provisions of section 7 thereof, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (a) of said Act as follows: Rural electrification program, $100,000,000; and rural telephone program, $9,000,000; and additional amounts, not to exceed $75,000,000, may be borrowed for the rural electrification program, and $25,000,000 for the rural telephone program, under the same terms and conditions to the extent that such additional amounts are required during the fiscal year 1952, under the then existing conditions, for the expeditious and orderly development of the program.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For administrative expenses, including not to exceed $500 for financial and credit reports, and not to exceed $150,000 for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), $7,750,000.

Farmers' Home Administration

To carry into effect the provisions of titles I, II, and the related provisions of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1000–1031), the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946 (7 U. S. C. 1001, note; 31 U. S. C. 82h; 12 U. S. C. 371; 35 D. C. Code 535; 60 Stat. 1062–1080); the Act of July 30, 1946 (40 U. S. C. 436–439); the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590r–590x, 590z–5), for the development of facilities for water storage and utilization in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States; the provisions of title V of the Housing Act of 1949 relating to financial assistance for farm housing (42 U. S. C. 1471–1483); the Rural Rehabilitation Corporation Trust Liquidation Act, approved May 3, 1950 (Public Law 499); and the Act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain mineral interests, approved September 6, 1950 (Public Law 760), as follows:

LOAN AUTHORIZATION

For loans (including payments in lieu of taxes and taxes under section 50 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and advances incident to the acquisition and preservation of security of obligations under the foregoing several authorities): Title I and

section 43 of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (except grants under 504 (a)) $38,000,000, of which not to exceed $5,000,000 of the amount available for the purposes of title I and section 43 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, may be distributed to States and Territories without regard to farm population and prevalence of tenancy, in addition to the amount otherwise distributed thereto, for loans in reclamation projects and to entrymen on unpatented public land (sums available for loans under title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to remain available until expended); title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, $110,000,000; the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended, $5,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed the foregoing several amounts shall be borrowed in one account from the Secretary of the Treasury, and, hereafter, such sums annually for the purposes of this paragraph as the Congress may determine by provision in appropriation acts, on the request of the Secretary of Agriculture, at such rate of interest as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, but not in excess of 3 per centum per annum; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sums to the Secretary upon the security of any obligations of borrowers from the Secretary under the provisions of said Acts: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may utilize proceeds from payments of principal and interest under such Acts to repay the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts borrowed therefrom for the purposes of such Acts: *Provided further*, That for the purpose of making loans pursuant to the foregoing authority, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that Act are extended to include such loans to the Secretary: *Provided further*, That repayments to the Secretary of the Treasury on such loans shall be treated as a public-debt transaction.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the making, servicing, and collecting of loans and insured mortgages, the servicing and collecting of loans made under prior authority, the liquidation of assets transferred to Farmers' Home Administration pursuant to the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946, the extension of financial assistance under the Housing Act of 1949, and the administration of assets transferred under subsection 2 (f) of the Act of May 3, 1950, $27,825,000, together with a transfer to this appropriation item of not to exceed $230,000 of the fees and administrative expense charges made available by subsections (d) and (e) of section 12 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses, including library membership fees or dues in organizations which issue publications to members only or to members at a lower price than to others, payment for which may be made in advance; not to exceed $20,000 for expenditures authorized by section 602 of the Organic Act of 1944 (12 U. S. C. 833); $400,000, together with not to exceed $2,325,000 of receipts from Farm Credit agencies, to be advanced to this appropriation, to cover the cost of supervision, facilities, examinations, and other services rendered to such agencies; $2,725,000.

Extension Service

PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, ALASKA, AND PUERTO RICO

For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, for cooperative agricultural extension work as follows:

Capper-Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts: Capper-Ketcham Act, the Act approved May 22, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 343a, 343b), $1,480,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, section 21, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 343c), $12,000,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, section 23, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended by the Act of June 6, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 343d–1), $12,500,000; additional extension work, the Act approved April 24, 1939, as amended (7 U. S. C. 343c–1), $555,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Smith-Lever Act to the Territory of Alaska, $13,950, and the Act approved October 27, 1949 (7 U. S. C. 343d–4, 5), extending to the Territory of Alaska the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act and sections 21 and 23 of title II of the Bankhead-Jones Act, $42,150; Puerto Rico, section 3 of the Act of March 4, 1931 (7 U. S. C. 386f), authorizing extension of the Capper-Ketcham Act to Puerto Rico, $31,348; the Act approved August 28, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 343f–343g), extending the benefits of section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, $408,000, and the Act approved October 26, 1949 (7 U. S. C. 343d–2, 3), extending the benefits of section 23 of title II of the Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, $71,502; and section 506a of title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U. S. C. 1476), $33,050; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, $27,135,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to administer the provisions of the Smith-Lever Act, approved May 8, 1914 (7 U. S. C. 341–348), and Acts amendatory or supplementary thereto, and to coordinate the extension work of the Department and the several States, Territories, and insular possessions, $850,000.

Office of the Secretary

For expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; travel expenses, including examination of estimates for appropriations in the field; stationery, supplies, materials, and equipment; freight, express, and drayage charges; advertising of bids, communication service, postage, washing towels, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department of Agriculture, $2,025,000, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such services and expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $109,280, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however*, That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as

changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations.

Office of the Solicitor

For necessary expenses, including payment of fees or dues for the use of law libraries by attorneys in the field service, $2,200,000, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses which several amounts not exceeding a total of $207,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation.

Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations

For necessary expenses for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations and for enabling the Secretary to coordinate and integrate activities of the Department in connection with foreign agricultural work, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only, $575,000.

Office of Information

For necessary expenses in connection with the publication, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins, documents, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and display of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and exhibits, and the coordination of informational work and. programs authorized by Congress in the Department, $1,215,268, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses, which several amounts not exceeding a total of $16,200, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, of which total appropriation amounts not exceeding those specified may be used for the purposes enumerated as follows: For preparation and display of exhibits, $104,725; for preparation, distribution, and display of motion and sound pictures, $75,600; for farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests of the people of the different sections of the country, an equal proportion of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or sent out under the addressed franks furnished by the Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, as they shall direct (7 U. S. C. 417) and not less than two hundred thirty thousand eight hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Senate and House of Representatives of part 2 of the annual report of the Secretary (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture), as authorized by section 73 of the Act of January 12, 1895 (44 U. S. C. 241), $611,128: *Provided*, That additional funds for preparation and display of agricultural motion pictures and exhibits relating to the programs of the various agencies of the Department authorized by Congress, not exceeding $150,000, may be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, from the funds applicable, and shall be available for the objects specified herein: *Provided further*, That in the preparation of motion pictures or exhibits by the Department, not exceeding a total of $10,000 may be used for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the establishment or maintenance of regional or State field offices, or for the compensation of employees in such offices.

LIBRARY

For necessary expenses, including dues for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; $641,237.

TITLE II—SPECIAL ACTIVITIES

RESEARCH ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL AGRICULTURAL MATERIALS

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out his responsibilities under sectiton 7 (b) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of July 23, 1946 (50 U. S. C. 98f), $550,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be subject to applicable provisions contained in the item "Office of Administrator, Agricultural Research Administration".

Eradication of Foot-and-Mouth Disease and Other Contagious Diseases of Animals and Poultry, Agricultural Research Administration

For expenses necessary in the arrest and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia, or other contagious or infectious diseases of animals, or European fowl pest and similar diseases in poultry, including the payment of claims growing out of past and future purchases and destruction of animals (including poultry) affected by or exposed to, or of materials, contaminated by or exposed to, any such disease, wherever found and irrespective of ownership, under like or substantially similar circumstances, when such owner has complied with all lawful quarantine regulations; and for foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest programs undertaken pursuant to the provisions of the Act of February 28, 1947, and the Act of May 29, 1884, as amended (7 U. S. C. 391; 21 U. S. C. 111–122), including expenses in accordance with section 2 of said Act of February 28, 1947, the Secretary may transfer from other appropriations or funds available to the bureaus, corporations, or agencies of the Department such sums as he may deem necessary, to be available only in an emergency which threatens the livestock or poultry industry of the country, and any unexpended balances of funds transferred under this head in the next preceding fiscal year shall be merged with such transferred amounts: *Provided*, That, except for payments made pursuant to said Act of February 28, 1947, the payment for such animals hereafter purchased may be made on appraisement based on the meat, egg-production, dairy, or breeding value, but in case of appraisement based on breeding value no appraisement of any such animal shall exceed three times its meat, egg-production, or dairy value, and, except in case of an extraordinary emergency, to be determined by the Secretary, the payment by the United States Government for any such animals shall not exceed one-half of any such appraisements: *Provided further*, That poultry may be appraised in groups when the basis for appraisal is the same for each bird: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be subject to applicable provisions contained in the item "Office of Administrator, Agricultural Research Administration": *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury by canceling notes issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury in the amount of $32,700,000 for funds transferred and expenses incurred under this head through fiscal year 1950

pursuant to authority granted in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1950.

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

To discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury for the net costs during the fiscal year 1950 under the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C. 1641–1642), $76,808,000.

TITLE III—CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the fiscal year 1952 for such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

Commodity Credit Corporation: Nothing in this Act shall be so construed as to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from carrying out any activity or any program authorized by law: *Provided*, That not to exceed $16,500,000 (and the amount in the last proviso in this paragraph is increased to $2,500,000) shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corporation: *Provided further*, That all necessary expenses (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest, including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury by canceling notes issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury in the amount of the capital impairment determined by the appraisal of June 30, 1950 (but not to exceed $427,000,000), pursuant to sections 1 and 4 of the Act of March 8, 1938, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a–1, 4): *Provided further*, That $1,000,000 of this appropriation shall be placed in reserve, to be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, only in such amounts and at such times as may become necessary due to the existence of substantial surpluses of the basic commodities requiring mandatory price support.

Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation: Not to exceed $1,100,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds of the Corporation shall be available for administrative expenses, including employment on a contract or fee basis of persons, firms, and corporations for the performance of special services, including legal services, and the use of the services and facilities of Federal land banks, national farm loan associations, Federal Reserve banks, and agencies of the Government as authorized by the Act of January 31, 1934 (12 U. S. C. 1020–1020h); and said total sum shall be exclusive of services and facilities furnished and examinations made by the Farm Credit Administration central office, interest expense, and expenses in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to

the Corporation or in which it has an interest: *Provided*, That promptly after June 30 of each fiscal year all cash funds in excess of the estimated operating requirements for the current fiscal year shall be declared as dividends and paid into the general fund of the Treasury: *Provided further*, That the aggregate amount of bonds the Corporation may issue and have outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $500,000,000.

Federal intermediate credit banks: Not to exceed $1,496,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds of the banks shall be available for administrative expenses and services performed for the banks by other Government agencies (except services and facilities furnished and examinations made by the Farm Credit Administration central office, and services performed by any Federal Reserve bank and by the United States Treasury in connection with the financial transactions of the banks); and said total sum shall be exclusive of interest expense, legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, and expenses in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to the banks or in which they have an interest.

Production credit corporations: Not to exceed $1,358,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds of the corporations shall be available for administrative expenses and services performed for the corporations by other Government agencies (except services and facilities furnished and examinations made by the Farm Credit Administration central office); and said total sum shall be exclusive of interest expense, legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, and expenses in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to the corporations or in which they have an interest.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 401. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law, the lump-sum appropriations and authorizations made for the Department under this Act shall be available for the purchase, in addition to those specifically provided for, of not to exceed 350 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and for the hire of such vehicles, necessary in the conduct of the work of the Department outside the District of Columbia.

Sec. 402. Provisions of law prohibiting or restricting the employment of aliens shall not apply to (1) the temporary employment of translators when competent citizen translators are not available; (2) employment in cases of emergency of persons in the field service of the Department for periods of not more than sixty days; and (3) employment under the appropriation for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations.

Sec. 403. Of appropriations herein made which are available for the purchase of lands, not to exceed $1 may be expended for each option to purchase any particular tract or tracts of land.

Sec. 404. No part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used for the payment of any officer or employee of the Department who, as such officer or employee, or on behalf of the Department or any division, commission, or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued, any prediction, oral or written, or forecast, except as to damage threatened or caused by insects and pests, with respect to future prices of cotton or the trend of same.

Sec. 405. Except to provide materials required in or incident to research or experimental work where no suitable domestic product is

available, no part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be expended in the purchase of twine manufactured from commodities or materials produced outside of the United States.

SEC. 406. Not less than $575,000 shall be available for contracts in accordance with section 10 (a) of the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427i) from appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Agricultural Economics; Bureau of Animal Industry; Bureau of Dairy Industry; Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering; Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine; Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry; Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics; and the Forest Service.

SEC. 407. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Department is hereby authorized hereafter to employ or otherwise contract with persons at regular rates of pay for necessary hours of work for emergency forest fire fighting and pest control and for handling of animals, including dairy cattle, without regard to Sundays, Federal holidays, and the regular workweek.

SEC. 408. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this Act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person employed for less than sixty days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property, the payment of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by this section.

No part of any appropriation contained in this Act or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

SEC. 409. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant

during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

(a) to not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;

(b) to positions filled from within the department;

(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

(d) to seasonal and casual workers;

(e) to meat inspectors;

(f) to field employees of the Soil Conservation Service and Production and Marketing Administration who provide conservation assistance to farmers and ranchers;

(g) to field operating and research employees engaged in work of county offices and other field locations;

(h) to employees of the crop and livestock reporting service: *Provided further*, That with the exception of the agencies and functions listed in (a) to (h) above, not more than 90 per centum of the amounts shown in the budget estimates for personal services shall be available for such purpose: *Provided further*, That when the total number of personnel subject to this section has been reduced to 90 per centum of the total provided for in the budget estimates for 1952, this section may cease to apply: *Provided further*, That in addition to the funds otherwise allowed under this section, the following agencies shall be allowed additional sums for personnel as follows: Commodity Exchange Authority, $58,928; Extension Service, salaries and expenses, $31,327; Office of the Secretary, $32,832; Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, $26,946.

Sec. 410. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred and fifteen, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the Department and its instrumentalities, cooperators and collaborators receiving personnel services from the Department: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half-time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed as permitting any increase whatever in personnel officers over and above the number otherwise provided for in this Act.

Sec. 411. Except for the car officially assigned to the Secretary of Agriculture, no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government whose principal duties consist of acting as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle (other than a bus or ambulance), unless such appropriation is specifically authorized to be used for paying the compensation of employees performing such duties.

Sec. 412. No part of the money appropriated for the Department of Agriculture by this Act or made available for expenditure by any corporation by this Act which is in excess of 75 per centum of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952 contemplated would be employed by the Department

of Agriculture or by such corporation, respectively, during such fiscal year in the performance of—

(1) functions performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title, or

(2) functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions described in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating public information publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion pictures, and similar material,

shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing the functions described in (1) or (2): *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to personnel engaged in the preparation and distribution of technical agricultural publications and farmers bulletins, and the Agriculture Yearbook, the reporting and dissemination of the results of research and investigations, the preparation and broadcasting of the "Farm and Home Hour" and similar radio programs, and other work required to carry out the duties and responsibilities of the Department imposed by law other than work intended primarily for press, radio and television services, and popular publications.

SEC. 413. This Act may be cited as the "Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1952".

Approved August 31, 1951.

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : O—1951